

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1970, 3:30 P.M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 189, including the President, 126 members of the faculty, and 62 students. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (95) must be present. Amendments to the Constitution require advance publication and 126 affirmative votes. Amendments to the Bylaws require advance publication and 95 affirmative votes. Other actions require only a simple majority of the members present and voting. The members of the all-University Administrative Committee are ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

Any member of the faculty and any student eligible to vote for Senators may be admitted to meetings of the University Senate and shall be entitled to speak at the discretion of the University Senate. Only elected members of the University Senate, the members of the Senate Consultative Committee, and, in case of a tie, the chairman shall be entitled to vote.

Any representative may designate any elected alternate from his institute, college, school, or student constituency as the alternate to serve in his place and stand by written notice to the clerk of the Senate prior to the commencement of any meeting of the University Senate.

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

ATTENDANCE RECORD

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

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

A summary of the attendance of members elected for the current academic year will be included in the June minutes.

Year 1969-70

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA THE SENATE DOCKET May 28, 1970

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

Owing to the volume of business for the meeting of the University Senate, May 28, 1970, the docket will be printed in segments in the University Daily. There will be a recessed meeting of the Senate on June 4. This recessed meeting will be convened at 2:15 p.m. The Committee on Business and Rules recommends that substantial amendments to action items should be prepared in advance by the sponsors for distribution at the meeting.

I. MINUTES FOR MARCH 12, 1970

Reported for Action

II. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Reported for Action

1970-71 Graduation Ceremony Procedures. Mr. Scribner, director of University Relations, presented proposed revisions for next year, which he indicated were made by his department and had been discussed with a student-faculty committee which was studying the procedure. The recommendations were as follows:

RECOMMENDATION 1: Attendance at University of Minnesota Commencement ceremonies should be made voluntary. Voluntary attendance is almost universally the case at other institutions. In addition to the space problems which have brought circumvention of compulsory attendance requirements on the Twin Cities campus, it is clear that practice at the University of Minnesota deviates from practice in other colleges in Minnesota and elsewhere, without apparent justification. NOTE: Attendance at Commencement is required of University of Minnesota graduates by action of the Board of Regents of May 9, 1916, and the Faculty Senate of May 4, 1916 (reconfirmed by the Senate February 16, 1922).

RECOMMENDATION 2: Frequency and management of formal commencement ceremonies on the various campuses of the University of Minnesota should be determined by the appropriate local campus governance structures. From the Twin Cities campus, the number of formal campus-wide commencement ceremonies should be reduced from five to three (August, December, and June) in 1970-1971; commencement programs for those ceremonies should include the names of students who have graduated during intervening periods and these ceremonies should be managed by the Department of University Relations under supervision of the Administrative Committee. Campus-wide ceremonies should be available to all graduates who wish to attend, whether or not they participate in the events described in recommendation 3.

RECOMMENDATION 3: That individual colleges and comparable units be encouraged to develop their own graduation or transition events, to be carried out as appropriate during the closing days of any quarter or summer session. Responsibility for organizing and carrying out such events should be the responsibility of the individual units, with the assistance of the managers of campus-wide commencement ceremonies as the needs of the groups and resources of the managing unit indicate. Development of representative campus-wide advisory groups should be encouraged on each campus.

RECOMMENDATION 4: That these revisions be reviewed by the Department of University Relations prior to the beginning of Fall Quarter of 1971 for appropriate reports and recommendations to the Vice Presidents and the Administrative Committee for the 1971-1972 academic year.

Approval of the 4 recommendations was moved and seconded. Mr. Smith emphasized that 1970-71 would be a trial year, and that many procedural questions would be taken up during the year. Mr. Scribner noted that each college which elected to schedule its own exercises would be responsible for making its own arrangements. The motion was then approved.

2. Reported for Information

Honors Committee. Mr. Ziebarth presented 3 nominations for the Outstanding Achievement Award and 2 for the Alumni Service Award, all of which were approved by common consent. **June graduation.** Mr. Scribner presented procedures for June graduation for the Twin Cities campus at the State Fairgrounds: Attendance by graduates would be voluntary; individual colleges could request permission for candidates to graduate in absentia, where the colleges arrange their own recognition exercises (the official graduation date would be June 13); only those to be presented hoods would cross the stage; and a representative for each other group would cross the platform on behalf of that group. The motion for acceptance of the recommendations was then approved.

Postdoctoral Fellow Identification. Mr. Shepherd reported on plans for identification cards for postdoctoral Honorary Fellows (those not covered in the 9400 series) following the issuance of an appointment form by their departments showing "without compensation", and he indicated that such identification would be useful as a protection to the University as well as to the individual himself and also would provide a means of determining the numbers of such persons on the campus. Mr. Smith suggested that Mr. Crawford prepare a welcoming form letter for deans to use for those designated as Honorary Fellows.

Procedure, research grant applications. Mr. Champion reported increasing pressure in processing research grant applications before the deadlines designated by the sponsoring agencies. He emphasized that his office needed sufficient opportunity to verify information on space, staffing, and equipment commitments, and that the Graduate School Research Center needed an opportunity to review applications in terms of institutional commitments. He then presented a statement of the requirement that such applications be in the Contracts and Grants Office not later than 15 days prior to the deadline for receipt in the sponsor's office, with an extra copy to be forwarded by Contracts and Grants to the Graduate School Research Center. The statement, to be issued as a Research Administration Bulletin, would indicate those applications not meeting the deadline would not be forwarded unless approved jointly as exceptions by the Vice Presidents for Academic Administration and Planning and Operations. The proposal was approved.

MARLIEE WARD
Secretary

III. ELECTION OF THE VICE CHAIRMAN

Reported for Action

The Constitution of the University Senate provides (Article III, section 5) that "A Vice chairman shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one (1) year."

IV. REPORT OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

Reported for Action

It has been recently noted that students in University College were not covered in the listing of units which make up the University Senate. University College has no faculty members who are not already members of some other faculty, but University College students are currently disenfranchised. In order to remedy this error, it is proposed to amend Article I, section 1 of the Bylaws of the Senate constitution, which lists voting units of the Senate, to add "(16) University College" and renumbering the following units.

It is proposed that this amendment to the Bylaws will be called up for vote at the spring meeting of the Senate.

ROGER B. PAGE
Chairman

V. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Reported for Action

Amendment of the Bylaws

The Committee on Committees has reviewed the proposal on libraries published as Item X in the Senate Minutes dated March 12, 1970, and a report of a subcommittee of the Library Committee dealing with reorganization of the Committee. We judge many components related to the operation and administration of the libraries to be outside the purview of the Committee on Committees. However, an increase in the representation on the Library Committee seems indicated in the opinion of the Library Committee, Mr. Stanford, and various other individuals.

Recommended for action: That the by-laws be amended to change the number of faculty members on the Library Committee from 8 to 12 and the number of students from 5 to 7.

Remarks: One recommendation of the proposal was that the members of the Library Committee be elected rather than appointed. It should be pointed out that the committee membership, although appointed by the President's office from a slate prepared by the Senate Committee on Committees, requires approval of the whole Senate. It is unfortunate that dissatisfaction with the composition of the Library Committee has been expressed at this time. The appropriate occasion for questioning committee membership is at the time nominees are submitted to the Senate for approval. The Senate Committee on Committees believes that if the Senate believes that election to committees is desirable then the problem of appointing vs. electing members to all committees should be met head-on rather than dealing with one committee at a time.

The Committee has discussed other facets of the proposal and, while no definite recommendations can be made, it seems evident that there are several avenues for revising the work and function of the Library Committee. The Library Committee should probably play a dual role. First, it is a policy-making group for the whole University Library System. Secondly, since the library is a service facility for the University, the Committee will inevitably be involved with operations, and it is to this question that the Faculty Action Caucus directed a large portion of its attention. In order to separate the policy and operational features of the Library Committee it might be worthwhile to consider the establishment of an Advisory Committee for Libraries (much as we have an Advisory Committee for University Computing) which could then consider operational questions as well as some others. A second possibility is, since there are local questions which are not common to other campuses, that the committee structure be changed so that each campus have its own library committee, the combination of local committees forming the Senate Committee on Libraries. Still another possibility is the establishment of a Task Force to study the Library from all points of view, i.e., funding, services, administration, and committees. All of these alternatives will require much closer investigation. The Committee on Committees believes that such matters of decision should be duly considered by the Library Committee and the library administration and are not matters for initial investigation by the Committee on Committees.

NEAL R. AMUNDSON
Chairman

VI. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN INVESTIGATION TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE THROUGH THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

Reported for Action

This report has been published previously in the University of Minnesota Daily, Thursday, May 14, 1970.

VII. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE

Reported for Action

Changes which the University Committee on Tenure recommends should be made in the Tenure Regulations.

1. Lengthening of probationary period for Assistant Professors. The changes proposed in this area would accomplish the following objectives:

a. They would lengthen the maximum probationary period for Assistant Professors from five years to seven years.

b. The entire period of an Assistant Professor's prior service on a full-time regular appointment at this University, or as an Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor at any other university or college, would be credited toward completion of the probationary period — with one exception. If the period of prior service at other institutions exceeds three years, the University would be authorized to require a probationary period of up to but not more than four years at this University. In such case only, the entire probationary period might exceed seven years.

c. The notice deadline would be moved up from June 15 to April 15 of the calendar year preceding the terminal year except that it would remain June 15 if an initial 2-year appointment is to be terminated.

d. They would make it clear that special contracts may be made with persons under which they would be appointed to the faculty with the rank of Associate Professor or Professor but without tenure.

The proposal to lengthen the probationary period for Assistant Professors from five to seven years originated in the Institute of Technology. Dean Cheston, speaking for the IT Administrative Committee, maintains that the present maximum period is too short to allow the faculty to judge the attainment of an Assistant Professor and forces decisions on the basis of insufficient evidence. Some departments have been resorting to the undesirable practice of making initial appointments temporary (T) in order to escape the limitations of the present maximum probationary period.

Dean Ziebarth endorsed Dean Cheston's proposal. There is enclosed a table indicating the policies of 13 other major institutions in this regard. Of the 13, only Pennsylvania State University and the University of Washington have a probationary period for Assistant Professors as short as Minnesota's.

Our Committee was persuaded by Dean Cheston and Dean Ziebarth. We feel that there is a need for flexibility in this respect which will help to maintain the quality of the faculty without injuring any individual Assistant Professor. Obviously, seven years will be the maximum probationary period; no department will be prevented from recommending tenure for an Assistant Professor before the seven year period expires. We recommend that Section 4 of the Regulations be amended to make this point explicit.

If the probationary period is lengthened, we see no reason why prior service as an instructor in this University or at any rank in any other institution should not be fully credited toward completion of the maximum probationary period — with the exception noted. We think the University should have three years of experience with an Assistant Professor here, no matter how long he may have served elsewhere before it must decide whether to grant him tenure. Again, nothing will prevent a department

from recommending tenure as quickly as it wishes in such case. With this safeguard, there is no reason not to credit service as an instructor in some other institution.

We should add that our recommendations are in accord with the Statement of Principles of the AAUP.

2. Clarify status of initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor.

The Regulations now provide that an appointment to the rank of Associate Professor is for an indefinite period, unless a special contract is entered into pursuant to Section 16 of the Regulations. The difficulty with Section 16 apparently is that few departments have been aware that it authorizes special contracts under which a person appointed to the rank of Associate Professor does not automatically acquire indefinite tenure.

Dean Cheston also proposed to our Committee that the first appointment to the rank of Associate Professor should normally be provisional for a period of two years, with termination of indefinite tenure at the end of the provisional period. Dean Ziebarth and Provost Imholte have endorsed this proposal. The enclosed table indicates that of the 13 institutions listed, only Iowa State, Texas and Wisconsin make tenure mandatory with appointment to the rank of Associate Professor.

Again, our Committee was persuaded that the departments should be given the option of recommending initial appointments to the rank of Associate Professor (thus excluding promotions from Assistant to Associate Professor) which will not entail tenure. However, we thought it important to have a procedure which would make it crystal clear to new appointees and to Central Administration whether a particular appointment to the rank of Associate Professor was or was not accompanied by tenure. For this purpose, we thought that the special contract procedure provided in Section 16 was ideal. So we merely recommend that Section 16 be amended to make clear that it can be used to accomplish Dean Cheston's purpose.

Furthermore, we see no reason to differentiate, in this respect, between initial appointment to the rank of Associate Professor and initial appointment to the rank of Professor. Flexibility is required when promising men with some years of non-academic experience are sought to be attracted to academic life. They may be attracted by the rank of Associate Professor or Professor, but it is too risky to require that every such appointment be a tenure appointment.

We also recommend that the maximum probationary period under special contracts be seven years, with the seventh year being the terminal year. No department will be prevented from recommending tenure for an Associate Professor or Professor under special contract in less than six years.

Finally, though it is not likely that persons with academic experience elsewhere will be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor under a special contract, it is possible that this may happen. To give each Department the widest possible latitude, it is recommended that this option also be provided.

3. Provision for temporary removal for cause. New Section 11, Removals for cause, now provides for temporary as well as permanent removal for cause. Presumably temporary removal, or relief from duties, is now possible. However, the Committee was persuaded that it would be useful to state explicitly that a person could be removed temporarily. On occasion this right of the University has been challenged by persons whose competence to carry out their duties has been questioned. Further, temporary removal would permit immediate action of a less drastic nature than the initiation of proceedings for permanent removal for cause in critical situations which might be resolved in a relatively brief period of time. Temporary removal would also allow for a period of time for the determination of a person's competence to carry out his duties.

4. Determination of physical or mental disability and some implementary changes. a) The University has experienced cases of alleged physical or mental disability in which faculty members refuse to cooperate with procedures that would be helpful to determine the facts. We are concerned in this matter to protect the interests of the University and students, as well as the rights of the faculty member in question. Accord-

ingly, we propose to add a provision at the end of new section 13(a) to authorize the University officer contemplating the initiation of removal proceedings to secure the advice he thinks may help him decide upon the course of action he should take. To this end he may require the faculty member in question to submit to an examination prescribed by the University, but only if an ad hoc committee constituted in a manner to protect the rights of the faculty member in question, agrees that this requirement should be imposed. If the faculty member then refuses to submit to the examination, his refusal may be taken into consideration by the University officer in deciding whether to initiate removal proceedings.

b) We have also added a provision in new section 13 that someone other than the person proposed to be removed may act on his behalf to request a hearing before the Judicial Committee. This is added because there might be situations in which the person proposed to be removed could not, or would find it difficult to, act on his own behalf.

Because experience in the administration of the present Regulations has shown that there is sometimes ambiguity with respect to whether the right to a hearing continues to be present in the absence of a request for a hearing, a statement is added which says that if no such request is made, the action removing the person, temporarily or permanently, becomes effective.

c) Similarly, new Section 14, Hearings in other cases, is changed to provide that a request for a hearing may be made by someone acting on behalf of the person who believes that his rights or status have been affected without his written consent. Again this is added because there might be situations in which a person could not, or would find it difficult to, act on his own behalf. And in order to facilitate the administration of these Regulations, a statement is added to make it explicit that failure to request a hearing as outlined in this section makes effective the action which has been taken.

5. Item 3, under Interpretations and Procedures is eliminated. The method of determining probationary credit is handled in new Section 6, Tenure of Assistant Professors. (See chart, lower left.)

Proposed Changes in the Regulations Concerning Faculty Tenure:

(1) **Sec. 4 Professors and Associate Professors on indefinite tenure.** Except as provided in Sec. 17, appointments to the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor are for an indefinite period. Professors and Associate Professors on indefinite tenure are subject only to removal for cause, or to retirement in accordance with University regulations. Promotion from an Assistant Professorship before the expiration of the maximum probationary period carries with it an appointment for an indefinite period.

(2) **Sec. 5. Maximum Probationary Period (New).** Except as provided in Sec. 4 and Sec. 6, the maximum probationary period of service of one who holds a regular faculty position shall be seven years. In computing the number of years served, the academic year is taken as the basis. Full-time service for less than two quarters in any year is disregarded in the computation, but full-time service for two quarters or more is counted as one year of service.

(3) **Sec. 6. Tenure of Assistant Professors.** Except as provided in Sec. 17, Assistant Professors acquire indefinite tenure only after serving for a probationary period as hereinafter defined. Assistant Professors on indefinite tenure are subject only to removal for cause, or to retirement in accordance with University regulations.

(a) The initial appointment of an Assistant Professor who has not previously served in a regular faculty position in this University or any other University or College is for a period of two years. If an Assistant Professor is not to be reappointed following his initial appointment, the President shall give him written notice on or before the June 15 of the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which his initial appointment terminates. His employment then terminates at the end of the second year of his initial appointment. In the absence of such notice, he shall on or before the June 15 of his second year either receive a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end thereof, or he shall be reappointed for a second period of two years.

If he is not to be reappointed following the second period of appointment, the President shall give him written notice on or before the April 15 of the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which his second period of appointment terminates. His employment then terminates at the end of his fourth year. In the absence of such notice he shall on or before the April 15 of his fourth year, receive either a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end of his fifth year of employment, or he shall be reappointed for a third period of two years.

If he is not to be reappointed following the third period of appointment, the President shall give him written notice on or before the April 15 of the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which his third period of appointment terminates. His employment then terminates at the end of his sixth year. In the absence of such notice he shall, on or before the April 15 of his sixth year, receive either a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end of his seventh year of service, or an appointment carrying indefinite tenure.

(b) If an individual, prior to his appointment as Assistant Professor at this University, has served full time on regular appointment at this University, his years of service in this capacity shall be credited toward completion of the probationary period. Unless he has previously received a written notice of termination from the President, he shall, on or before the April 15 of his sixth year of combined service, receive either a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end of his seventh year of combined service, or an appointment carrying indefinite tenure.

(c) If an Assistant Professor, prior to his appointment to this rank at this University, has served full time for a period of three years or less as an Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor in one or more other Universities or colleges, his years of service in this capacity shall be credited toward completion of the probationary period. Unless he has previously received a written notice of termination from the President, he shall, on or before the April 15 of his sixth year of combined service receive either a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end of his seventh year of combined service, or an appointment carrying indefinite tenure.

(d) If an Assistant Professor, prior to his appointment to this rank at this University, has served full time for a period of more than three years as an Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor in one or more other Universities or Colleges, it may be agreed, in writing at the time of his appointment that he may be required to serve a probationary period of up to but not more than four years at this University. His initial appointment as an Assistant Professor is for two years. If he is not to be reappointed following his initial appointment, the President shall give him written notice on or before the April 15 of the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which his initial appointment terminates. His employment then terminates at the end of the second year of his initial appointment.

In the absence of such notice, the Assistant Professor shall be reappointed for the second period of one year. If he is not to be reappointed following his third year of service, the President shall give him written notice on or before the April 15 of the second year of his first period of appointment. His employment then terminates at the end of his third year of service. In the absence of such notice he shall, on or before the April 15 of his third year, receive either a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end of his fourth year, or an appointment carrying indefinite tenure.

Except as provided in Sec. 17 no person who has acquired the right to indefinite tenure by service as an Instructor loses it by promotion to Assistant Professor, by change of title, or otherwise.

(4) **Sec. 17. Special Contracts.** (a) A major purpose of these Regulations is to state the normal minimum tenure rights of persons appointed to the faculty of this University. These Regulations do not prevent the granting of indefinite tenure at an earlier date than is herein set forth, or the making of special contracts in writing with individual members of the faculty

Institution	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor
Univ of Illinois,	Same as Assoc Professor	Appointments shall be for an indefinite term, except that first appts. or temporary appointments may be made for shorter periods. Indefinite tenure on re-appt.	Period of provisional status; 7 yrs max. Prior service elsewhere, credit of up to 3 years.
Univ of Iowa, State	Indefinite Tenure	Indefinite tenure.	Initial appt is for three yrs; provisional appt may be renewed for add'l three years; no provision for indefinite tenure in grade. (Academic VP reports movement to reduce prov'l period in this rank.)
Univ of Maryland,	Indefinite Tenure	First appt is provisional and is for two years; re-appt carries indefinite tenure; promotion carries indefinite tenure.	Initial appt is for three yrs. may be renewed for an add'l three years; indefinite tenure in grade after six years unless promoted.
Univ of Michigan,	Indefinite Tenure	General policy, indefinite tenure. Policies provide for exceptions. Not widely used.	Initial appt is for three yrs; may be renewed for add'l three yrs; indefinite tenure in grade after six yrs unless promoted.
State Univ Ohio, State	Indefinite Tenure	First appt is normally provisional for persons appointed from outside Univ, and is for two yrs; re-appt carries indefinite tenure as does promotion to rank.	Max. period of provisional appt of seven yrs; indefinite tenure in grade after seven yrs unless promoted.
Univ of Pennsylvania,	Same as Assoc Professor	First appt is provisional and period is indefinite with max of seven yrs. Promotion to rank carries indefinite tenure.	Initial appt is for two yrs; may be re-appt'd for an add'l two yrs; fifth year is terminal or indefinite tenure granted in rank unless promoted.
State Univ of Purdue	First appt is provisional and is for two yrs; re-appt. and promotion to grade carries indefinite tenure.	First appt is provisional and is for three yrs; re-appt and promotion to grade carries indefinite tenure.	Max. period in grade is seven yrs; indefinite tenure in grade after seven yrs unless promoted.
Northwestern	Not known	Same as Assistant Professor	Indefinite tenure after seven yrs of full-time service. Service at other institutions not counted.
Texas,	Indefinite Tenure	Indefinite Tenure	Provisional period is six yrs; an appt for a seventh yr is terminating.
Univ of Washington,	Same as Assoc Professor	Indefinite Tenure (provisional appts may be made for three years.)	Provisional period is three yrs; an appt for a fourth yr is terminating or indefinite tenure in grade.
Univ of Wisconsin,	Indefinite Tenure	Indefinite Tenure	Initial appt is provisional and is for three yrs; max. period in grade is seven yrs; promotion after seven yrs or indefinite tenure in grade. Previous full-time service, instructor or above, counts except that probationary status at U of Wisc may extend for as long as four yrs, even if max period is then exceeded.
Univ of Indiana,	Same as Assoc Professor	Indefinite tenure may be conferred at initial appt or after shorter period than seven yr probationary period.	Probationary period is seven yrs. Includes full-time service at other institutions if equivalent service at IU would count. Probationary period of not more than three yrs at IU may be required regardless of length or prior service elsewhere.

for appointments for periods of time different from those indicated.

In particular, special contracts may be utilized to make probationary appointments at the senior ranks of Associate Professor and Professor. Under such special contracts probationary appointments for two or three year periods may be made. Special contracts for two year periods may be renewed not more than three times; special contracts for three year periods may be renewed not more than twice.

Unless the faculty member under such a special contract has previously received a written notice of termination from the President, or an appointment carrying indefinite tenure, he shall on or before the April 15 of his sixth year of service receive either a terminating appointment of one year, which terminates his employment at the end of his seventh year of service, or an appointment carrying indefinite tenure.

If a faculty member under such a special contract, prior to his appointment to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor at this University, has served full-time as an Instructor, Associate Professor, or Professor in one or more other Universities or colleges, his years of service in this capacity shall be credited toward completion of the probationary period in the manner provided for Assistant Professor in Sec. 6 (b) and (c).

Every special contract shall be in writing, signed by the faculty member, the department head, the dean or other officer who heads the unit concerned, and the Academic Vice President. It shall state that it does not conform to the ordinary regulations governing faculty appointments, and shall be effective only after approval by the Board of Regents.

(b) Nothing in these regulations prevents the establishment and later discontinuance of special departments, programs, or institutes of an experimental or temporary character. All appointments made in connection with such special projects are non-regular. The President shall give written notice to all persons who receive such appointments of the contingent, experimental, and probable temporary nature of the projects and of the probable termination of their employment when the projects are discontinued.

(5) Sections 4 through 19 will require renumbering, Sec. 4 becoming Sec. 5, etc.

(6) Sec. 11. Temporary or permanent removals for cause. Every person who holds a faculty position is subject to temporary or permanent removal for cause before the time set for the regular termination of his appointment. The causes for temporary or permanent removal are only such as seriously interfere with the person's capacity competently to perform his duties, or with his usefulness to the University.

Sec. 13. Procedures in cases of proposed temporary or permanent removal for cause.

(a) In the case of a dean or director who also holds a regular faculty position the President may initiate the proceedings for removing the incumbent from his faculty position or designate some other academic officer to initiate the proceedings. In all other cases of proposed temporary or permanent removal for cause the dean or other officer who heads the academic unit concerned, or a person designated by the President, shall initiate the proceedings for removal. Removal proceedings are initiated by written notice of the proposed action and the reasons therefor to the person to be removed, with a copy to the President. The initiating officer may relieve him of his duties pending action by the President to suspend. If the initiating officer is uncertain whether to initiate proceedings against a dean, director or holder of a regular faculty position who is alleged to be suffering from a physical or mental disability which seriously interferes with his capacity competently to perform his duties, or with his usefulness to the University, he may request the individual involved to submit to an appropriate physical or mental examination prescribed by the University. The initiating officer shall not request the individual involved to submit to such an examination without the concurrence of an ad hoc committee composed of one faculty member designated by the Dean of the Medical School, one by the Dean of the Law School and one by the individual involved. If the individual involved is a member of the Law Faculty, the Dean of the Medical School shall designate two members; if he is a member of the Medical Faculty, the Dean of the Law School shall designate two members. If the individual involved fails to designate a member, the two members designated shall choose the third member of the committee. Refusal by the individual involved to submit to such an examination may be taken into account by the initiating officer in determining whether to initiate proceedings.

(b) Suspension during proceedings. Sole power to suspend rests with the President. The suspension may be with or without pay as the President determines to be in the best interests of the University. Prior to making a decision with respect to such suspension, the President shall consult with an ad hoc committee of academic personnel of his own choosing, including at least one member of the Faculty Consultative Committee. A person under suspension without pay pending proceedings for removal for cause continues to hold such rights as University insurance, retirement, hospitalization, and the like unimpaired until the Board of Regents has made final disposition of his case. A suspension without pay, insofar as such special rights are concerned, is regarded as a leave of absence without salary, unless the person suspended is subsequently reinstated.

(c) Further proceedings. A person against whom temporary or permanent removal proceedings have been initiated for any of the causes specified in Sec. 11 is entitled to a hearing before the Judicial Committee if, within thirty days after receipt of the notice from the initiating officer he, or someone on his behalf, makes written request therefor to the chairman of the Judicial Committee. If no such request is made, the action removing him, temporarily or permanently shall become effective.

If he requests an investigation, the Judicial Committee shall, as expeditiously as possible, make its investigation and report its findings of fact in writing to the President, with a copy to the appealing faculty member. After reaching his decision, the President shall notify the faculty member in writing concerning the general nature of his recommendations at least three weeks before the meeting of the Board of Regents at which he proposes to present his recommendations, unless the faculty member agrees in writing to a shorter period of notice. If the faculty member desires a hearing before the Board, he must make a request in writing to the President within five days after receipt of the notice from the President. The Board of Regents shall give him a full and open hearing unless he requests that those present be limited to individuals who are parties of interest, or are invited by parties of interest.

(d) Right of resignation. A person who has been relieved of his duties or suspended from his faculty position may resign at any time before the final decision by the Board of Regents. His resignation automatically terminates the proceedings on his appeal.

Sec. 14. Hearings in other cases. Any person who holds a faculty position is entitled to a hearing before the Judicial Committee on any action which, without his written consent, affects his rights or status under these Regulations. To make this right effective, the individual concerned, or someone on his behalf, must, within thirty days after his receipt of written notice of the action or proposed action alleged to affect his rights or status, give written notice to the chairman of the Judicial Committee stating the manner in which he believes his rights or status are affected. The Judicial Committee shall hear such cases as promptly as possible and report its findings of fact as in cases of removal. If the individual concerned, or someone acting on his behalf, fails to give the required written notice, the action shall become effective.

(7) Under Interpretations and Procedures, item 3.

(8) Items 4 through 12 under Interpretations and Procedures require renumbering, item 4 becoming item 3, etc.

CARL AUERBACH
Chairman

VIII. REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING AND RELATIONS

1. Reported for Information

This being the last scheduled meeting of the year, the following items which describe areas of committee discussion or activities this year are reported for information:

1. In keeping with the spirit of the Twin Cities Assembly action of May 7, the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations at its May 14, 1970 meeting approved the following recommended interim pro-

cedure which relates to waiver of end of 6th week deadlines for Spring Quarter 1970.

- 1) cancel-add procedures for changing courses, cancelling without grade, or for changing: from A-F to P-N (or S-U when appropriate) or vice versa should be completed promptly, at least by May 22
- 2) the lapse of Winter Quarter incompletes to F's may be extended to Fall Quarter 1970

Colleges may also waive the P-N restrictions for Spring Quarter 1970. Changes of the type described are college responsibilities and may be dealt with on an individual basis. Students concerned should check with their college offices. Reference is made to the May 12, 1970 policy document of the University Senate Consultative Committee as endorsed by the Administrative Committee May 13, 1970. We believe the actions taken by the Committee on Academic Standing and Relations as stated above permit the options listed in the Consultative Committee document.

2. The Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations was created as a part of the reorganization of the University governance structure. It has assumed most of the areas of responsibility previously assigned to the Senate Committees on Admissions Policy, Student Scholastic Standing, and Institutional Relationships. Several early meetings of the committee were devoted to reports and discussions of the activities of these committees and outlining directions for the new committee. Three subcommittees were established to examine the concerns of the committee in specific areas and to then bring appropriate recommendations to the full committee for discussion and action. The subcommittees and their areas of activity are:

a. Scholastic Standing (Leslie King, Chairman) Items considered include:

- (1) Changes in handling of incompletes (See items reported for action)
- (2) Consideration of experimental grading practices--In accordance with Section 19 of the University Senate action of March 9, 1967, which provided for Senate Committee approval of experimental plans for grading, this committee has reviewed several proposals as follows:
 - (a) S-U grading at University of Minnesota, Morris (approved by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations, Senate Minutes, March 12, 1970)
 - (b) Changes in grading for the University Medical School (approved by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations, Senate Minutes, March 12, 1970)
 - (c) Two other proposals are in the process of formulation at the time of this report: one from the College of Education recommending S-U grading for certain courses, and a second from the Council on Liberal Education regarding grades in the University College.
- (3) When the P-N grading system was instituted, provision was made for a review by the end of the 1970-71 school year. The review is being conducted by the Bureau of Institutional Research. This committee has heard reports from Keith Wharton of the BIR staff on the status of the review and will report to the Senate next year on the results of the studies made.

b. Admissions Policy (James Preus, Chairman)

The subcommittee's discussions have centered on the University's "Planned Growth" statements. A part of this discussion took place at a meeting of the full committee with Vice Presidents Smith, Champion, and Wenberg, and Chairman Ibele of the Senate Committee on Planning in attendance. Among the specific matters discussed at that meeting and subsequent meetings were the current restrictions being applied in the Colleges of Liberal Arts and Education and in the General College, the Kegler Report, the St. Paul proposal, and the Planning Committee's "Plan for a Plan."

c. Institutional Relationships (Jeanne Lupton, Chairman)

The discussions of the subcommittee have centered around ways of establishing effective communications and other professional relationships between faculty members at the various state institutions of higher education.

- (1) The subcommittee has proposed the establishment of liaison persons in all departments to establish and maintain contact with corresponding departments at other institutions in the state.
 - (2) A series of mini-conferences involving the University of Minnesota and other institutions was recommended. The first meeting involved counselors from North Hennepin State Junior College and representatives from CLA, GC and the Admissions Office.
 - (3) The subcommittee has heard reports on a number of planned or completed conferences which with one or two exceptions have involved members of the committee or staff in implementation. These include the MINCOPP conference of physics teachers, the Fourth MIFC, a CBS-junior college biology conference, the midwest regional conference on English in the two-year college, a College of Education conference for bypassed populations, and a University of Minnesota conference on training programs for medical laboratory technicians for community health services.
 - (4) Reports have been received and discussions held on the HECC statewide computer study and the HECC program review committee activities.
3. An Advisory Committee on Private Secondary Schools was appointed in 1968. The revision of the Criteria for the Accreditation of Private Secondary Schools (Senate Minutes, December 4, 1968) was completed and will become effective next fall. Following completion of this revision, the committee has been reviewing ways of implementing the Criteria and streamlining the accreditation process.
4. The on-going program of high school accreditation and transfer recognition has continued (See items reported for action). Annual Reports from private high schools have been reviewed and approved for continued accreditation. Biennial transfer recognition reports from eight colleges have been reviewed and approved for continued recognition.
5. Preliminary discussions have been held on the Duluth resolution (Senate Minutes, March 12, 1970). The committee requested additional information from Associate Vice President Kegler. His report has been received and will be discussed by the committee subsequent to submitting this docket.
6. A number of special meetings of the committee were held to discuss the Kegler Task Force Report and the St. Paul Prospectus report. Members of the committee were encouraged to develop their own statement and these, together with a statement by the Chairman, were forwarded to the Vice President's Task Force on behalf of the committee.

2. Reported for Action

In recent years increasing concern has been expressed relative to the immaturity amass early in their college careers incompletes which automatically become F's after six weeks of their next quarter of attendance. Since the "administrative" F, lapsed from I for a student who did not complete a course, is something quite different from the "earned" F and yet contributes in the same manner to the grade point deficiency under the present grading system, it would appear that there is need for a different approach to the handling of incompletes.

Against this background the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations proposes a modification in the handling of incompletes which will permit the various academic units greater flexibility in the making of decisions related to student scholastic status.

The Proposal

Referring to the "Grading System" section of any recent Class Schedule, the following changes are proposed:

For the present rule 8, which reads as follows:

"8. There shall be a temporary grade of I (incomplete) which may be assigned when there is not sufficient information immediately available to permit the assignment of a permanent grade. This would be the case if the student has not done all the work of the course or if the instructor does not know why a student, officially registered for his course, has not appeared or has left. If the instructor is able to ascertain that the student has no adequate excuse or if the student attended beyond the sixth week and was failing, F or N is the appropriate grade, with the choice of F or N depending on the grading system under which the student had registered for the course.

"An I which has not turned into a permanent grade or into a W (official cancellation with approval of the student's college) by the end of the sixth week of the next regular quarter of attendance shall become an F or N. (This does not apply to students in the Graduate School or to students in a Master's degree program in undergraduate colleges; their I grades remain until changed by the instructors to some other grade.) Permission to complete the work must be obtained from the instructor. He may set a makeup deadline of less than 6 weeks.

"An extension of time may be permitted for removal of I grades upon recommendation of the instructor concerned and with approval of the Scholastic Committee of the college in which the student is registered. If the petition is presented after the end of the sixth week of the next quarter of residence, a restoration of the mark of I and the completion of the required work would be considered in the nature of a special examination for which the special examination fee would be required."

Substitute the following:

"8. There shall be a registration symbol I (incomplete) that shall be assigned when a student neither earns a final grade by completing a course nor qualifies for a W (withdrawal) as defined in section 9 below. A student may earn a permanent grade in place of an I with permission of the instructor (or of the department, in the unavailability of the instructor). For the convenience of both students and instructors, I's should be made up early in the next regular quarter of attendance, but instructors may extend the time if they believe delay is justified. Students do not have to be registered in order to make up I's.

"An I which is not made up remains on the student's record; it does not count in the grade point average. When an I is made up, it is removed from the record."

Leave 9 as stated:

"9. There shall be a symbol W to indicate official cancellation from a course without grade. This shall be assigned in all cases of official cancellation during the first 6 weeks of classes irrespective of the

student's standing. Whether cancellation is permitted is within the authority of the student's college to determine. After 6 weeks, W shall be posted only if the student is not failing at the time of official cancellation. W is a registration symbol, not a grade, and shall be posted by the recorder on the basis of the student's registration activity as approved by the student's college."

Eliminate 10 (stated for information below) and renumber remaining sections:

"A student who cancels officially or otherwise leaves a class after the sixth week of classes and is failing at the time shall receive an F or N." **Discussion**—The proposal is much more permissive than the present regulations, in that there is no grade point penalty attached to not completing a course. Scholastic committees within the various colleges may wish to develop scholastic probation and exclusion standards based on credits completed and requiring higher grade point averages than at present. Colleges could maintain essentially the same scholastic standards as at present but simply define them differently. With the I as defined in the proposal instead of the "administrative" F (I lapsed to F), however, the student's grade point loss would not be so severe as to preclude his chances of later success here or elsewhere.

Adoption of the proposal would, in addition, eliminate the often expressed criticism that an "administrative" F (I lapsed to F) should not have the same value in appraising a student's academic performance as an F earned by doing failing work in the course.

Under the provisions of the proposal, the make-up of a course which is not completed is left as a matter to be settled between the student and instructor (or department in the absence of the instructor), without the specific University-wide deadline which has brought the various scholastic committees so often into negotiations under the present rules. With the change suggested, departments and instructors could set and administer whatever deadlines seemed most appropriate.

3. Reported for Action by the Faculty Senate

1. Renewal of Accredited Status for Private Minnesota High Schools

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

Cathedral High School	St. Cloud
Crosier High School	Onamia
Minnehaha Academy	Minneapolis
Our Lady of Peace High School	St. Paul
St. Anne Area High School	Wabasso
St. Benedict's High School	St. Joseph

These schools have been recommended for renewal of accredited status after review of reports of visiting committees, annual reports, and other supplementary information submitted by each school. In each case, the recommendation favoring continued accreditation has the concurrence of visiting committees composed of representatives drawn from the University, public and private high schools, and the State Department of Education. The time spent at the schools ranged from an evening and the following day in the smallest schools to an evening and two days for those schools which were reviewed concurrently with the North Central Association.

2. Accreditation of Private Minnesota High Schools

During 1969-70 the application of one private high school, Archbishop Thomas L. Grace High School, Fridley, was reviewed for possible accreditation by the University of Minnesota. This school had completed an institutional self-study utilizing the **Evaluative Criteria of the National Study of Secondary School Evaluation**.

The school was visited on February 16, 17 and 18, 1970, by a 26-member visiting committee composed of representatives from public and private high schools and the University of Minnesota and chaired by Richard Kimpston, Assistant Professor of Secondary Education, University of Minnesota. Procedures followed were those outlined in the **Criteria for Accreditation of Private Secondary Schools** (Senate Minutes, November 20, 1952, pp. 24-33). On the basis of the self-study and the visitation report, this Senate Committee recommends:

That Archbishop Thomas L. Grace High School, Fridley, Minnesota, be added to the list of private secondary schools accredited by the University of Minnesota. Accreditation is granted subject to the submission of annual reports which satisfy the **Criteria**.

3. Transfer Recognition for Normandale State Junior College, Bloomington

Normandale State Junior College began operation in the fall of 1968. In February, 1969, a committee chaired by John Gooding visited the institution and recommended that Normandale State Junior College be granted Transfer Recognition with the provision that a revisit be conducted during the 1969-70 academic year when the second year is in progress.

On February 28 and 29, 1970, the institution was revisited by the following committee:

James Preus, Director of Student Personnel, Lower Division, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota (Chairman)
John Alexander, Associate Professor, Physical Education, College of Education, University of Minnesota
Robert Benson, Chairman, Department of Marketing and Business, St. Cloud State College
Raymond Bohling, Assistant Director, University Libraries, University of Minnesota
Dwight Culver, Academic Dean, College of St. Catherine
Adele Donchenko, Chairman, Department of Slavic Languages, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota
John Imholte, Provost, University of Minnesota, Morris
Howard Jenkins, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota
Donald Johnson, Dean of Students, Anoka-Ramsey State Junior College
Walter Johnson, Professor of Physics, Institute of Technology, University of Minnesota
Paul Manz, Professor, Music, Concordia College, St. Paul
Manley Olson, Assistant Executive Secretary, Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations, University of Minnesota
Louis Safer, Professor, Zoology, College of Biological Sciences, University of Minnesota
James Underhill, Professor, Zoology, College of Biological Sciences, University of Minnesota
Robert Wright, Chairman, Department of English, Mankato State College

The committee was favorably impressed by the excellent program offered at Normandale. This was especially true of the transfer program. In fact, several committee members voiced concern that the transfer curriculum was receiving a disproportionate share of attention, resources and status.

The major problems identified by the first committee were the inadequacy of the library and the heavy faculty work loads. While some progress has been made, both remain as major concerns. The overall quality of the institution is such, however, that the visiting committee unanimously approved the following recommendation which is endorsed by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations and submitted to the Senate for approval:

That the University of Minnesota continue transfer recognition of Normandale State Junior College, i.e., provide for the transfer of satisfactorily completed credits, appropriate to the program to which a student may be admitted.

4. Transfer Recognition for Lakewood State Junior College, White Bear Lake

Lakewood State Junior College, the fourth of the new metropolitan junior colleges, began operation in the fall of 1967. In February, 1968, a visiting committee chaired by Paul Cartwright recommended that Lakewood State Junior College be granted transfer recognition but that a revisit be held during the second year of operation.

In the spring of the 1968 academic year, the president of the college resigned and his successor did not assume the office until June, 1969. During the interim the chief administrative role was filled by an administrative committee consisting of Minnesota State Junior College Board staff members and administrators and staff from the college. Because of this situation, the college requested a postponement of the revisit. As a result of a meeting of the chairman and staff of this Senate Committee and the proposed chairman of the visiting committee with the interim administrative committee and the incoming president in the spring of 1968, it was decided that the visit would be rescheduled for the 1969-70 academic year.

On February 2 and 3, 1970, the following committee visited the school:
Gerhard Weiss, Associate Dean for Humanities and Fine Arts, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota (Chairman)
Paul Berrisford, Assistant Director, University Libraries, University of Minnesota
C. Lloyd Bjornlie, Executive Secretary, Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations, University of Minnesota

Charles Byrne, Administrative Assistant, Department of Music, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota

Norman Kerr, Associate Dean, College of Biological Sciences, University of Minnesota

Gordon Kingsley, Professor and Head, Student Personnel Services, General College, University of Minnesota

Raymond McClure, Director of Freshman English, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota

William Nunn, Associate Professor of Social Science, St. Cloud State College

Manley Olson, Assistant Executive Secretary, Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations, University of Minnesota

Gilbert Smith, Chairman, Department of Economics and Business Administration, Wisconsin State University

Richard Goblirsch, Associate Professor of Mathematics, College of St. Thomas

The major weakness noted by the initial committee was due primarily to the totally inadequate physical facilities. This situation still exists. However, the college is scheduled to move into new facilities before the beginning of the next academic year. While the lack of physical facilities has been a deterrent, this has not prevented the development of a sound educational program. In fact, the committee was impressed and amazed at the way in which staff and students were surmounting the obstacles inherent in housing a collegiate institution in a discarded elementary school and a church basement.

Most of the other problems noted by the committee were those commonly associated with developing institutions. Work loads of faculty and administrators were very heavy, but were being improved. Curriculum development needs to be accelerated. Again the problem appears to be one of necessary staff and administrative time plus past problems of lack of administrative leadership.

The visiting committee was impressed with the capable and dedicated faculty and the excellent cooperation between administrators, faculty and students. It unanimously approved the following recommendation which is endorsed by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations and submitted to the Senate for approval:

That the University of Minnesota continue transfer recognition of Lakewood State Junior College, i.e., provide for the transfer of satisfactorily completed credits, appropriate to the program to which a student may be admitted.

4. Reported for Action by the Faculty Senate

5. Proposed Revision of Policy on College Transfer Recognition

Prior to spring, 1967, the University through the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships served an accreditation function for other colleges and universities, which did not have regional accreditation (North Central Association for Secondary Schools and Colleges). At the request of such institutions, the University sent visiting committees to evaluate all aspects of development. The primary objectives of such accreditation were (a) the maintenance of adequate standards to facilitate student transfer, (b) the provision of educational support and assistance to facilitate the development of higher education in the state. Until such time as an institution received North Central Association accreditation this recognition served as a basis for transferring appropriate courses.

In June, 1967, the Senate approved a new policy for relating other institutions to the University. The change was precipitated by a broadening of North Central practices new types of recognition were established) and by organizational changes in the patterns of higher education in the state (particularly the establishment of the State Junior College Board). With the developments described, overall University accreditation became unnecessary at best and inappropriate to other institutions in some instances. Thus, the more limited approach of "Transfer Recognition" was adopted.

The desire of the University to serve a cooperative partnership role in Minnesota higher education rather than any role which might be construed as regulatory, a review of the priorities of University resources devoted to institutional relationships, and the availability of suitable alternatives to present "Transfer Recognition" policies are all important reasons why the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations recommends the approval of a new policy governing the transfer of credit from other colleges and universities to the University of Minnesota.

As additional background for the proposal, several existing general policies relating to credit transfer are useful to note:

1. individual courses or educational experiences may yield credit in transfer for particular individuals via University Credit by Examination procedures.
2. appropriate work satisfactorily completed taken at institutions outside of Minnesota is considered for transfer if the teaching institution is regionally accredited or if the credit is accepted by an institution analogous to the University of Minnesota in the particular state (e.g. another Big Ten University).

The Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations recommends that the following policy defining the bases for recognition of credit from other colleges and universities replace the "Transfer Recognition" policy approved by the Senate Committee on Institutional Relationships in April, 1967, and reported to the Senate for information in June, 1967. All points are to become effective upon approval of the policy.

1. The University discontinues present policies for formal "Transfer Recognition" relationships with other Minnesota colleges and universities as a basis for credit transfer.
2. To replace present policies either of the following conditions is an acceptable basis for the transfer of appropriate, satisfactorily completed credit from other Minnesota colleges and universities to the University of Minnesota.
 - a. If another Minnesota institution now has or subsequently develops any level of official recognition from the North Central Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges (NCASSC), that shall be the basis for the appropriate transfer of credit; currently for example, the levels of recognition are "Correspondent Status," "Candidate Status," and "Accreditation Status."

NOTE: This is a broadening of current policy in that the use of "Correspondent Status" is added. Correspondent Status can be achieved from NCASSC early in the institution's development and involves certification that the institution can be expected to move toward full accreditation in a systematic fashion. A time schedule for review is established. As is currently the case for Candidate Status, credit transfer becomes effective when an institution achieves Correspondent Status, without visitation by the University.

 - b. If another Minnesota institution does not now have any NCASSC affiliation but does now have a Transfer Recognition relationship with the University, that recognition shall be continued through the 1971-72 academic year. (Note: This is consistent with current policy in that review of any institution not having NCASSC recognition by 71-72 is called for.) By the end of spring quarter 1972, the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations shall contact such Minnesota institutions and, if NCASSC affiliation has not been obtained, and it is judged not to be a reasonable affiliation, shall negotiate one of the following alternatives which shall be reported to the Senate for information (or action if it chooses).
 - (1) continued transfer of credit based on successful transfer experience data or other arrangements better suited to this particular situation.
 - (2) discontinuance of a regularized overall transfer relationship.

T. E. KELLOGG
Chairman

IX. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

1. Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has approved and joins with the Council on Liberal Education in recommending that the University Senate:

1. endorse the proposal for A Program for Institutional Support of Educational Development at the University of Minnesota;
2. recommend that the President and the Board of Regents approve the Program and take the administrative steps necessary to implement the Program, recognizing that funding must necessarily be phased in in accordance with available resources; and

- that the Senate Committee on Committees establish the University Committee on Educational Development to perform the functions outlined in the proposal. (See report of the Senate Committee on Committees).

A proposal¹ by the All-University Council on Liberal Education for

A PROGRAM FOR INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT OF EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Abstract

It is proposed that the University of Minnesota establish an on-going All-University Educational Development Program in support of faculty and faculty-student efforts to improve undergraduate and graduate education. The Educational Development Program would provide flexible support for the systematic renewal of existing programs and for development of new programs, thereby generating experience for planning of future academic programs of the University. It is proposed that the Program be financed with a specific and regularly budgeted fraction of the total costs for instruction of the University. By the end of a five-year period, scheduled to insure harmony with present budgeting procedures and existing resource requirements, this proposal provides that 3% of University instructional resources be allocated to the Educational Development Program. These resources would be budgeted, in approximately equal amounts, at the three administrative levels of the University (departmental, collegiate and all-University) through a merit review procedure designed to insure that the resources of the Educational Development Program are directed to a coordinated and systematic plan to improve education at this University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Introduction
- II. Educational Development as a Program for Systematic Change
 - A. The Ideas of Educational Development
 1. The Idea of Renewal
 2. The Idea of Innovation
 3. The Idea of Development as the Basis for Academic Planning
 - B. The Responsibility for Educational Development
- III. The Operating Principles of the Educational Development Program
 - A. The Level of Support for the Program
 - B. The Allocation of Resources Under the Program
 1. The Principle of Equally Shared Responsibility
 2. The Principle of Allocation Proportional to Instructional Activity
 3. The Principle of Allocation Based on Merit
- IV. The Plan for Institutional Support of Educational Development
 - A. Operation of the Plan
 - B. Implementation of the Plan

I. Introduction

Perhaps the only certainty in the future of higher education is change. Whatever our colleges and universities have been and are, they will not long remain so. The question in higher education is not whether to change, but how and in what directions. Yet change can, in some respects, be planned. The program proposed here offers a specific plan for systematically renewing and developing the educational programs of the University of Minnesota. Its basic assumption is that the University—that is, the faculty, students, and administrators—contains the essential ideas, energy, and motivation for evolutionary change. This plan provides only the resources to support such change.

Social organizations—of which universities are an important example—do not change easily and seldom change themselves. Institutional change seems to require the confluence of four elements of change: pressure for change, agents for change, programs for change and resources for change. Universities are experiencing enormous pressure for change and many agents for change are evident. What is lacking is a systematic program for change and resources to support thoughtful efforts for change.

The pressures for change are obvious. They come from both without and within the university. But while elements outside the university are potent sources of pressure, they cannot be effective agents of productive change, for they understand too little the intimate workings of the university. Universities are unusual among social institutions in that—through their students—they include an element which is at once an external pressure for change and an integral agent for change. But it is the faculty which, because it provides the essential continuity of the university, must be the central change agent. Through its profound responsibility for intellectual development, the faculty has always accepted and cultivated the role of change agent. It is one of the great paradoxes of higher education that as the faculty has earned greater and greater responsibility for the operation of the university, it has so little exploited the potential for institutional change latent in its prime responsibility for intellectual change. Responding to the legitimate pressure for change by students, the faculty is the obvious principal agent for constructive change.

The program for change, proposed in section II below, argues that a major, on-going program of educational development, designed to address the complex of educational problems of a huge university, is an established and effective mechanism for evolutionary change.

The basic principles on which the Educational Development Program should be based are discussed in section III; and in section IV a detailed plan, consistent with these principles, is proposed.

II. Educational Development as a Program for Systematic Change

A. The Ideas of Educational Development

We base our argument for a University program for Educational Development on three ideas: Renewal, Innovation, and Educational Planning. Each of these ideas has an important place in University efforts to generate the future of higher education from the present realities.

1. The Idea of Renewal

Course and curriculum renewal is hardly new to higher education. Existing programs constantly change in a never-ending process of selecting texts, revising lecture notes, and modifying requirements. Indeed, the major fraction of faculty instructional effort goes into the quiet and systematic renewal of the educational program. Nevertheless, there is growing evidence that the resources available to faculty—time, support and materials—are unequal to the needs. The rapid development of technologies—T.V. and other audio-visual mediums, information storage and retrieval systems, computing devices—require far greater efforts for full utilization than can be accommodated by present renewal efforts. Rapidly developing disciplines require much greater efforts of renewal than were once tolerable. The complexities of interdisciplinary and multi-disciplinary presentations require collaborations and joint efforts now nearly impossible to arrange. Concrete evidence for the need of new resources in support of program renewal comes from experience with the Small Grants Program of the Council on Liberal Education. The majority of proposals under this Program of presentation of old material for existing courses. Most of these programs have been for straightforward efforts to develop new materials or new quests come from single faculty members who speak to the inability to respond to felt need in their teaching due to lack of modest resources for the improvement of a segment of a course.

Very often renewal of a program takes the form of new course development. This manifestation of educational development most often takes place at the upper levels of the curriculum—graduate and upper division—where advances in knowledge suggest new patterns of organization of materials. But it also occurs with the recognition of a need for a thorough restructuring of old materials as in the development of new inter-disciplinary courses or in the recognition of long neglected areas of curricular emphasis. And it also develops with a recognition of the impact of a new technology on the methodology of a discipline or area of study.

The development of such courses or programs cannot proceed with the vigor appropriate to a major university by piecing such development into the occasional breaks of the academic calendar, by squeezing them from the urgencies of the on-going instructional program, and by financing them with the intermittent leaks and occasional over-flow of the formal budget reservoir. Yet the future of academic programs lies in these development efforts; it is self-defeating not to provide in a systematic and regular way for their support. The very least a university can do is make specific and direct provision of resources for the renewal of the instructional programs through existing course and program improvement and new course and program development.

2. The Idea of Innovation

Innovation has been touted so many times and in so many places as a solution to the ills of higher education that its meaning, when averaged across the academy, is elusive. Trumpeted innovations in teaching method, in assessment procedures, in admission procedures, in general education requirements, in purposes of the undergraduate experience almost always turn out to have appeared at an earlier time in the same or a different place.

Nevertheless, we believe it a mistake to dismiss innovation as merely rediscovery, accurate as that may be. For the value of innovation is more subtle. Doing things in a new way—regardless of how many times they have been done that way by others at other times—is unsettling and, in an imaginative mind, liberating. To teach Newtonian mechanics using age old numerical analysis techniques (made practical by the use of high speed computers) has

been exhilarating to teacher and student by liberating the material from the confines of analytic techniques. To teach a course on a P-N grading basis has encouraged experimentation with learning experiences not easily assessed by traditional grading.

To encourage innovation, then, is thoroughly justified by its leavening action, if not by its direct results. And indeed this University has taken many steps in recent years to encourage innovation through enabling programs and procedures: P-N grading, independent study courses, honors seminars, directed teaching programs, off-campus study procedures, experimental course programs, independent research opportunities, work study programs, living-learning centers, Martin Luther King tutorial groups. But we have seen, too, that providing the form for innovative efforts does not insure the substance of innovative teaching and learning. What is now needed, even more than new forms, are the resources to realize the potential of innovation. Realizing this potential is the work of teachers and students, and the resources essential to such work must be a part of the on-going program of the University.

3. The Idea of Development as the Basis for Academic Planning

Planning for future eventualities has never been one of the strengths of universities. The difficulties of planning—whether for facilities, staff, parking or whatever—arise from the fact that all elements of the University program are generated by the needs of the academic program. And the difficulties of projecting the future of academic programs are legion. (Indeed only a few wise men have succeeded in untangling, in retrospect, the past of academic program development.) We suggest here that a carefully developed and monitored program of educational development—which is, after all, program development for the future—will provide evidence of the directions which academic programs will take in the future and of indicators of future needs. For example, if the Educational Development Program in a given period supports undergraduate assistants, one can infer something of the geometry of future a large number of successful experiments with small class teaching using classrooms. And if there is enormous development activity in the use of on-line computing in instruction, the future needs for the distribution of computer terminals can be estimated.

Thus if the development activities chosen by the faculty are monitored by those responsible for providing the facilities and resources for on-going instruction, projections of the future needs of academic programs will be increasingly possible.

It is important to recognize that the idea of development as a basis for educational planning implies a series of new and difficult problems. Presumably, implementing some of the successful development efforts will require new resources. In a time when it is unlikely that new resources will be easily gained, the question will be not simply "whether to implement" but "if implemented, what other program must go." Difficult as such questions will be, we feel the institution will be invigorated as they are raised. We much prefer the trauma of choice to the ennui of decision by default.

¹ Prepared by a Council appointed sub-committee composed of: W. E. Ibele, L. H. Lofquist, M. C. Reynolds, J. M. Smith, D. R. Studelska, J. H. Wernitz (Chairman).

B. The Responsibility for Educational Development

Obviously the responsibility for educational development rests with the faculty of the University together with their students. But the responsibility for decisions regarding what development is to be done, and by whom, must be shared by the three administrative levels of the University at which academic decisions are made: departmental, college and centrally. Thus while all faculty who do educational development belong to departments, it does not follow that educational development decisions should be made only by departments; nor does it follow that educational development decisions should be made only by colleges because all faculty belong to colleges.

It is clear that some educational development decisions are best made by departments. Departments are uniquely capable of making educational development decisions regarding renewal of courses and curricula in the discipline or area of academic concentration of that department. Obviously the decisions, subject to review, regarding educational development in these areas should be left to the department concerned both to proclaim the locus of responsibility for such decisions and to simplify the procedures for supporting the development. Obviously then, a portion of the University resources for educational development should be formally allocated, by line item, in the printed budget of each academic department.

There are, however, areas of the academic program shared by all departments of a college but the specific responsibility of none. Decisions regarding educational development for these areas are the responsibility of the college, and educational development funds must therefore be available at the college level. The development of interdisciplinary courses and programs, of new departments, of college-wide programs such as freshman seminars, of more effective counseling and advising services, of new criteria for college admissions—all are of a scale appropriate to collegiate units. Obviously then, a portion of the University resources for educational development should be formally allocated, by line item, in the printed budget of each collegiate unit.

And finally there are areas of the academic program not specific to any single college of the University but shared by all. Programs relating the University to the community, efforts to interrelate the programs of the University to those of other educational institutions of the State, plans for inter-campus educational development efforts, development of the all-University liberal education requirement are all examples of activities which require decisions on an all-University basis. Indeed, much of the work of University Senate Committees would be sharply accelerated by the availability of development resources to pursue specific tasks. It follows then that a portion of the University resources for educational development should be formally allocated, by line item, in the printed budget of the central administration.

The designation of responsibility and resources to meet the responsibilities for educational development at the three administrative levels does not imply independence of the three levels. On the contrary, it is essential that the colleges and central administration be aware in detail of development efforts at the departmental level, and conversely. And it is essential that the collegiate deans and the Academic Vice President be able to exercise leadership in the allocation of educational development funds to insure they are used to match the total contour of University responsibilities. Consequently, the resources allocated to the Educational Development Program should be distributed across the three administrative levels of the University through a program review procedure interlacing the three levels. The intent of the Educational Development Program, then, should be to encourage the exercise of responsibility for educational development in departments, colleges and centrally. The review procedure should determine the extent to which the responsibility is met and resources should be allocated accordingly.

III. The Operating Principles of the Educational Development Program

In constructing the elements of a long-range program with major implications for the future of the University, it is important to focus attention on the essential principles on which the program is based. On the other hand, it is also necessary to be sufficiently detailed to encourage a common understanding of the program.

In this section we offer our best advice, and the rationale for it, for the operating principles of the Educational Development Program. It would be foolish to suppose that these recommended operating principles will satisfy all requirements for future educational development of the University. Consequently, while we believe the principles proposed will serve well during the initial years of the Educational Development Program, we assign the function of reappraisal to the new Senate Committee on Educational Development proposed in section IV-A.

The general principles under which the Educational Development Program will operate provide the guides for determination of the level of support and the procedures by which resources under the Program will be allocated.

A. The Level of Support for the Program

Specifying the level of support for the Educational Development Program could be accomplished by one or another of three alternative procedures: a) a fixed sum could be specified for the purpose; b) a fixed percent of the annual instructional budget of the University could be assigned to the Program; c) a formula reflecting the changing needs for educational development of the different segments of the University could be devised.

We reject the first as insensitive to the changing needs of the institution; we reject the third as unnecessarily complicated but affirm that the plan to be adopted must incorporate procedures

sufficiently flexible to be routinely sensitive to the diverse needs of a complex University.

We recommend the second — that a fixed percent of the annual University instructional budget be designated for the Educational Development budget — for two reasons:

- This principle is simple and can be directly and easily applied in the complex procedure of University budgeting.
- This principle ties the level of support firmly to the most rudimentary measure of the educational function of the University.

To be specific in what follows, we define the University instructional budget² in the following way: The University instructional budget is the sum of the instructional budgets of all of the academic departments plus the operating and administrative costs of all central college activities which relate to instruction. The instructional budget of an academic department is the sum of academic salaries including administrator salaries (line item and unassigned instruction), civil service salaries (line item and miscellaneous payroll) and supplies and equipment.

For the 1969-70 fiscal year, the total instructional budget of the University, so defined, is \$56.1 million (\$49.6 million of which is budgetarily assigned to the 162 academic departments,³ the re-

² We are aware of small but meaningful ambiguities in this definition which will require informed negotiation by University administrators in consultation with the Educational Development Committee. As an example, one unit of the University has included in its budget the salary and operating costs of the library serving that unit. Since the definition does not include the University Library system—or any other "free" services in support of instruction—an adjustment in the figure used as the instructional budget of that unit would be required to establish reasonable parity.

mainder to central college activities). Dividing \$56.1 million evenly 162 departments indicates that \$346,000 per year is required to support the instructional activities of an average sized (and therefore hypothetical) University academic department.

In moving from these facts to a specific recommendation for the percent of support to be assigned to the Educational Development Program we can offer only the general guide that the support should be neither so small as to be ineffective nor so large as to be an impossible burden on the limited resources of the University.

We believe that 3% of the annual instructional budget, directed to the Educational Development Program, would provide an adequate and meaningful but hardly extravagant investment in the future educational programs of the University. This recommendation is not to be understood as a replacement of or substitute for resources presently directed, largely through departments, for the improvement of educational programs. Rather, it is proposed to supplement existing efforts, to encourage flexibility in the procedures for allocation of development resources, to stimulate development efforts inhibited under present procedures, and to provide a sharp focus on the importance of systematic and imaginative efforts to improve the instructional program.

Translated into dollar terms using data from the 1969-70 fiscal year, 3% of the annual instructional budget is approximately \$1.7 million. If the allocation procedure were to distribute this resource among the various units according to their instructional budget

³ 25% of the academic departments have instructional budgets less than \$80,000; 50% of departments have instructional budgets less than \$200,000; 75% of departments have instructional budgets less than \$360,000; the largest department has an instructional budget of about \$2.0 million.

(caution: see section III-B below) then the faculty members of one-fourth of the departments would have less than \$2,400 for educational development per year; faculty members of one-fourth of the departments would have between \$2,400 and \$6,000; faculty members of one-fourth of the departments would have between \$6,000 and \$10,800; and one-fourth between \$10,800 and \$60,000. Stated differently, a 3% allocation to educational development would provide, on an average, about \$10,000 for the use of faculty members of an average sized department each year.

B. The Allocation of Resources Under the Program

We propose that the Educational Development Program allocate its resources in a manner which will emphasize three basic principles: the responsibility for allocation of resources should be shared, approximately equally, among the three administrative levels of the University; the support at the department and college level should be scaled to the level of instructional activity; and the support should be allocated through the budgeting procedure on the merit of proposed educational development projects. We justify basing the allocation on these three not always congruent principles in the following way.

1. The Principle of Equally Shared Responsibility

It was argued in section II-B that the responsibility for decisions regarding the development of educational programs must be shared among the three administrative levels of the University: departmental, collegiate and all-University. To emphasize and insure the validity of this point, we recommend that the basic decision regarding allocation of approximately one-third of resources of the Educational Development Program (i.e., 1% of University instructional resources) be made at the departmental level; that the decisions regarding one-third of the resources be made at the collegiate level and that the decisions regarding the remaining one-third be made centrally.

It is important to realize that we speak of the responsibility for decision making. The actual resource allocation resulting from these decisions, based on the merit of proposals and the perspective from various administrative levels, will certainly differ from a formula 1% — 1% — 1%. For example, a department, following a period of extensive development, may require no development funds during a given year. Or a college may wish to devote a significant fraction of its collegiate resources to an extensive development of one of its departments. Or central funds may be allocated to an extensive effort in a particular college or even a particular department of a college. The point to be emphasized here is not the level where the resources are utilized but the level at which the decision to allocate is to be taken; and we believe this responsibility for decisions should be shared equally at the departmental, collegiate, and all-University levels.

2. The Principle of Allocation Proportional to Instructional Activity

We believe the allocation of resources for educational development to a unit of the University should be strongly influenced by the level of instructional activity of that unit. In developing our recommendation on this point we have considered resource allocation based on three measures of instructional activity: instructional budget (as defined in III-A above); full-time-equivalent instructional staff; and student credit hours taught.

In the main, there are strong correlations between these three measures of instructional activity, but there are also remarkable differences. But because the differences between the measures are not larger than intelligent allocation procedures can accommodate⁴ and because the actual allocation of funds must be based on the merit of proposals—as is argued in section B-3 following—we believe the preliminary decisions on allocation should be based on the instructional budget. It may well be that, as experience with the program grows and as data on which to base a more meaningful measure of instructional activity are generated, another scheme should be adopted; a recommendation for such a change would be the responsibility of the Educational Development Committee. In the meantime, to measure instructional activity in terms of the instructional budget and to guide distribution on that basis seems entirely adequate to the purposes at hand.

3. The Principle of Allocation Based on Merit.

The great universities have flowered on the supposition that the level of support should be based in major part on the quality of ideas and the commitment of energy. We believe the educational development of the University would be best served by a procedure which encourages the most stimulating, imaginative and potentially most productive efforts to improve the educational program.

⁴ For example, consider resources to be allocated by decisions taken at the collegiate level: to shift from an allocation among colleges based on instructional budget to one based on full-time equivalent instructional staff (taken from the October 15, 1969, payroll) would require a redistribution of 12% of the funds; to shift from an allocation among colleges based on instructional budget to one based on student credit hours taught (taken from the fall quarter 1969 second week class list) would require a redistribution of 24% of the funds.

We argued, in the previous sections, that support for the Educational Development Program should be set at 3% of the University instructional budget and allocated through a procedure under which decisions regarding one-third (i.e., 1%) of this resource be made at the departmental level, one-third at the college level and one-third centrally. But we emphasize that the purposes of the Educational Development Program will not be realized by a mindless allocation on a strict formula basis.

To the contrary, the procedure by which resources are actually allocated must provide for thoughtful and perceptive student-faculty advice and the opportunity for the exercise of leadership by college deans and all-University leaders in order to insure that the future instructional programs of the University are built on the best ideas for educational renewal and innovation. The allocation of resources under the Educational Development Program must be accomplished through a student-faculty-administration review procedure designed to insure that this investment in the future is based on the quality of ideas and the potential for productive change.

IV. The Plan for Institutional Support of Educational Development

We propose an on-going program whereby (following a four-year

period during which resources are assembled on a schedule detailed below) 3% of the regular instructional resources of the University are systematically and formally assigned to the development of the educational program. The base on which this 3% is to be computed is defined as the sum of the academic, administrative, and civil service salaries and supply and equipment budgets of academic units with a responsibility for instruction.

Subject to the review and allocation procedure discussed below, up to one-third of these educational development funds (i.e., about 1% of the total University budget for instruction) will be budgeted at the department level, up to one-third at the college level and the remainder at the all-University level. That is, a given academic department will have assigned, as a line item in its printed budget, a sum equaling up to 1% of its share of the college instructional budget; each college will have assigned, as a line item in its printed budget, a sum equaling up to 1% of the total instructional budgets of the departments of the college plus the operating and administrative costs of central college activities which relate to instruction; the office of the Vice President for Academic Administration will have assigned as a line item in its printed budget the remainder of the Educational Development 3% (that is, not less than 1%) of the total instructional budget of the University.

A. Operation of the Plan

The plan provides that 3% of University instructional resources will be regularly available for educational development. However, the decisions for actual expenditures will be monitored and the detailed budgeting approved by the following procedure:

Annually and at a time distinct from but prior to the period during which the University budget is prepared for submission to the Regents, each department chairman will prepare a report of the use being made of the educational development resources available to his department during the current year along with a proposal for the use of funds for the next year. It is assumed that the report and proposal would be developed in consultation with the appropriate student-faculty departmental committees and that the proposal be based on the assumption of a 1% allocation.

The report and proposal from each department would be submitted to the dean of the college. In consultation with an appropriate student-faculty college committee the departmental proposals will be reviewed. While it should be expected that any deficiencies in departmental proposals would be relieved by consultation, the dean would, nonetheless, have the right to reduce to less than 1% the educational development budget of any department.

The dean would then transmit the departmental reports and proposals to the Vice President for Academic Administration along with his recommendation of the appropriate percent (1% usually, but possibly less).

At the same time the dean would prepare a report of the use of the college educational development funds for the current year and a proposal for the use of the 1% college funds for the following year. It is assumed that the dean would work through the student-faculty college committee in preparing the report and, especially, in developing the college proposal.

The college report and proposal would be submitted to the Vice President for Academic Administration for review and approval.

The Vice President for Academic Administration would be advised by a special all-University student-faculty committee composed in part of members able to represent the concerns and interests of the Council on Liberal Education, the Graduate School Executive Committee and the University Senate Committee on Educational Policy.⁵ The Vice President, or his designate, would serve as an ex-officio member of this committee. The function of the committee would be five-fold.

1. To review the departmental reports and proposals and the recommendations of the college deans.

The committee could recommend to the Vice President for Academic Administration modifications in these proposals but the budgeted percent in any department is not to exceed 1%.

2. To review the collegiate reports and proposals. The Committee could recommend to the Vice President for Academic Administration a budgeted percent in any college up to a maximum of 1%.

3. To receive, review and recommend proposals submitted directly to the Vice President for Academic Administration from any part or any level of the University.

The resources under which these proposals would be supported would consist of the 1% residue from the 3% University Educational Development Fund after the departmental and college allocation has been made. The resources available for central distribution would, then, not be less than 1% of the University instructional budget.

4. To develop the detailed guidelines and operating procedures, consistent with the Plan here recommended, for the Educational Development Program. For the smooth and effective operation of the Program, extensive effort by a staff in support of the Committees' work will be required. Such a staff should be organized at the direction of the Vice President for Academic Administration largely from existing University staff with experience in educational research and development, educational assessment and evaluation, and the several educational technologies.⁶

5. To report annually to the University Senate on the status of and plans for the Educational Development Program and to recommend to the University Senate any policy changes suggested in the light of experience with the Program.

With the advice of this all-University student-faculty committee, the Vice President for Academic Administration would, following any further review and adjustment he felt appropriate, apply assigned percentages in constructing the formal University budget.

The above plan of operation is proposed in order to achieve three major objectives:

1. To emphasize in concrete fashion that the responsibility for educational development rests firmly at the three levels of academic responsibility: the department, the college, and centrally.

2. To provide a review procedure which will insure that resources assigned to educational development are used exclusively for that purpose. The review procedure will provide ample opportunity for advice and counsel at all levels to insure optimum use of these modest resources. It is assumed that the review procedure will only rarely provide percentages less than 1%; such cases will be considered failures of the idea of University educational development.

⁶ In this connection, it is important to observe that many of the educational development efforts supported under the Educational Development Program will require the facilities and assistance of the staff of the University service and research units that operate in support of instructional programs (especially Audio-Visual Resources, the University Libraries, the University Computer Services, the Department of Radio and Television, the Bureau of Institutional Research, the Center for Research in Human Learning, and the Programmed Learning Center).

And most importantly:

3. To provide in a regular way for the development of the educational program of the University as a normal, unexceptional, systematic, and on-going responsibility of the University.

B. Implementation of the Plan

It is not, of course, realistic to suppose that a plan involving complexities of resource allocation and program development of the magnitude proposed can be implemented abruptly. Consequently, we propose a detailed schedule by which the University could realize the full potential of the proposed plan over a 5 year period.

To offer a specific schedule as part of our recommendation is not to imply an inflexibility which would be inappropriate to any projection into the future of this University. We offer a schedule

The schedule below may be summarized as follows:

EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ALLOCATION				
Fiscal Year	Departments	Colleges	All-University	Total University Commitment
1970-71	0.00%	0.50%	0.00%	0.50%
1971-72	<0.75%	<0.50%	>0.25%	1.50%
1972-73	<1.00%	<0.50%	>0.50%	2.00%
1973-74	<1.00%	<0.75%	>0.75%	2.50%
1974-75 and thereafter	<1.00%	<1.00%	>1.00%	3.00%

to emphasize the necessity of implementing the Educational Development Plan in an orderly way over a reasonable period and to offer a reasoned schedule for that orderly development. Obviously financial disaster for the University would require modification in all programs of the University, including the Educational Development Program; obviously too, good fortune coupled to felt need, would argue for an acceleration more rapid than proposed toward full implementation of the Educational Development Program.

Discussion:

1. The schedule for the Total University Commitment

The proposed schedule provides for a modest initial commitment to implement the program by July 1, 1970. The amount of money represented by ½% of university instructional resources would total about \$280,000. This sum is a realistic first step both from the point of view of resource allocation and from the point of view of existing program needs.

Following the first year of experience we propose a 1% increase to 1.50%. This increase will permit manageable implementation of all elements of the plan. While the ease with which this sharp increase in the allocation to 1.5% of University instructional resources can be accomplished will turn on the degree to which the 1971 Legislature understands the intent and potential of educational development, we believe it essential that the program progress at this level of support from the beginning of full-scale activity. The need is too great and faculty-student interest too high to say otherwise.

Following the 1971-72 fiscal year we propose that the annual total University commitment increase by ½% per year to the steady-state value of 3.00%. This gradual increase will permit the orderly and systematic development of all three components of the program to the level which we believe appropriate to the diverse and complex instructional effort of the University.

2. Schedule for Distribution of Resources Under the Plan

We propose that all of the resources of the program during the initial year of operation be directed to the colleges. We assume that the relatively modest resources available for this first year of operation would be directed to pressing educational problems identified by departmental units and would be supported on a proposal-grant basis.

We propose this plan of operation for three reasons:

1. Evidence from the operation of the Small Grants Program of the Council on Liberal Education and the special program to purchase educational apparatus indicates many straight-forward but important departmental development efforts, as yet unsupported, which could be mounted without extensive additional planning.

2. The limited funds must be distributed in grants of sufficient size both to have an effect and to provide a visibility for stimulation of later efforts. Distribution of ½% among all departments according to level of activity would provide an average of only about \$1700 per department.

3. Allocation of funds from the college level would activate the full review procedure to be used under full implementation of the plan. That is, proposals would originate in departments resulting from an assessment of departmental educational needs. The college dean, in consultation with the college committee, would identify those proposals to be supported with the college ½%; the college recommendations would be forwarded for review and approval by the Vice President for Academic Administration and the all-University committee. Once the substantive decisions had been made, the ½% would be budgeted in the college educational development item and the supported projects initiated.

Following the initial year of operation, the full plan will be in operation, albeit at support levels less than the full 1% - 1% - 1% allocation. Support at the departmental level will reach the 1% level first, in the third year of operation, on the thesis that the felt need and backlog of projects is most acute at this level. The college and all-University support will be increased regularly, the colleges receiving relatively greater support during the first two years of operation of the plan and increasing apace thereafter.

2. Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has approved and, with the endorsement of the University College Committee, and with the concurrence of the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations with respect to section III A., joins with the Council on Liberal Education in recommending that the Senate approve and adopt the report on the Development of Undergraduate Programs at the University of Minnesota.

⁵ If the University Senate approves the recommendations of this report, we recommend that the Senate Committee on Committees take steps to establish (as a standing committee of the Senate reporting to the Senate through the Educational Policy Committee), the Senate Educational Development Committee to perform the functions outlined in this section for the all-University student-faculty committee.

A REPORT FROM THE COUNCIL ON LIBERAL EDUCATION ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

For higher education the decade of the sixties revealed marked discontent with traditional designs of curriculum and instruction. On campuses throughout the land accustomed patterns of collegiate education were criticized, sometimes assailed, by students, faculty and administration. Proposals were enthusiastically advanced for novel collegiate structures, for student participation in decision-making, for increasing the scope of educational experiences, for new ways of perceiving and evaluating the roles of student and teacher. And not infrequently these proposals were adopted and tried. It is likely, indeed, that the seventies will witness increased demands for experimentation and innovation in the entire field of higher education, and that the tempo of change will become more rapid.

It was appropriate, therefore, for the Council on Liberal Education in the fall of 1969 to appoint a subcommittee to consider the development of vital undergraduate programs at this University. In his charge to that subcommittee, the Chairman of the Council, Dr. James F. Hogg instructed it to assess "those elements of the organization of the undergraduate programs of this University which encourage and those which inhibit the use of the full resources of the University. This analysis, "the charge continued, "should serve as a basis for suggestion of organizational patterns designed to overcome these inhibitions."

The report was written by a subcommittee including Susan Kalitowski, Lloyd Lofquist, Leon Reisman, Steven Sundre, James Wertz, Norman Kerr (chairman).

The response of the subcommittee is given in three sections, as follows:

I. Where are we?

A. Current opportunities for diverse and innovative undergraduate programs.

B. Limitations on developing new kinds of undergraduate programs.

II. Where should we go?

A. A proposal for change.

B. A plan for the implementation of approved experimental programs.

III. Senate actions required for implementation of Part II.

1. Where Are We?

A. Current opportunities for diverse and innovative undergraduate programs.

In addition to a rich array of more or less traditional majors and curricula, a student at the University of Minnesota may choose from a number of other options. If he is a student in the College of Liberal Arts he may devise a unique interdepartmental major, or enroll in established interdisciplinary programs such as Humanities, American Studies, or Pre-Theology. If he is a student in General College, with its free-elective program and its general comprehensive examinations, he can explore a cur-

riculum which avoids specialization. Or a student may elect an intercollegiate major, such as Agricultural Journalism; or secure a joint degree, for example from CLA and the College of Education; and he will discover that departments fiscally located outside CLA may offer majors in the Arts College, employing the services of intercollegiate faculties.

University College functions to permit students to design individual intercollegiate programs. For example, they may build programs combining social science and humanities courses (CLA) with business (School of Business Administration); or an interior design curriculum including courses in CLA, Business Administration, and the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics; or a Peace Corps program embracing the social sciences and agriculture. The possibilities in University College are limited only by the needs and the ingenuity of the student and the total resources of the University.

Those who wish to study independently have a variety of choices available. With the consent of a faculty member a student may designate his enrollment in a course as "Independent Study," and negotiate with the faculty member the nature of his responsibilities. By registering for extra credit in a course he may explore a subject in greater depth. He may investigate an area not regularly treated in class by enrolling in an "Independent Readings" course, offered in most University departments. He may study on his own in order to take a course by examination. He may even embark upon an off-campus independent study project for as many as 15 credits, having enlisted the services of University College to act as his agent in negotiating how these credits may be applied towards a degree.

Often in response to student demand new "temporary" courses arise, focusing upon critical current issues such as "Crisis in Human Relations," "Urban Crisis: Civil Disorder in the Twin Cities," "Vietnam: Image and Reality," "Biology and the Future of Man," "Contemporary Race Relations." The Honors Program, by student request, is offering one-time-only courses; the Living-Learning Center helps students build field-work courses involving the community.

Instructional techniques which demand student participation are being widely used. Students can register for field work or internships, for seminars and recitation sections, for conferences and tutorials. The Teacher Service Corps, besides exploring new kinds of courses and making them available to students, is studying different methods of evaluation. The P-N system of grading may encourage students to take courses outside their special fields of competence.

It is abundantly clear that undergraduate education at the University often is impressively various and imaginative, and that a student has considerable sovereignty, if he cares to exercise it, to plan educational experiences congenial to his individual needs.

B. Limitations on developing new kinds of undergraduate programs

If the University appears to be decently liberal in providing flexible opportunities for a student to build his undergraduate educational experience, why do relatively few students take advantage of these opportunities, and who do a significant and vocal number of students decry what they consider rigid patterns of undergraduate education?

Part of the answer must lie in bureaucratic pressures which inevitably accompany size: multiple All-University rules, further explicit regulations by colleges and departments, distribution requirements — in other words, the entire structure designed to monitor the progress of thousands upon thousands of students towards university degrees. Interesting and viable alternatives, as we have seen, are indeed available. But the sheer expertise and perseverance needed to discern and to follow such alternatives discourage both students and advisors. Frustrated and uneasy in the face of their own inexperience and half-knowledge, they settle for what seems safe and expedient. All too often, exploration is discouraged by closed sections. As a result, the luxuriant resources of the University — the other concomitant of its size — are too rarely employed to create a unique educational experience for the individual student. Under these conditions advisors find they have little advice to give, and the warm promise of a human and personal relationship between student and advisor often dwindles into a polite encounter when a faculty advisor simply signs, without comment, a program the student has already mechanically assembled.

University architecture, too, tends to succumb to the pressure of size and preserves the traditional educational style. Forced by the exigencies of budget to offer some large classes in large classrooms, a department discovers that the University routinely anticipates filling these classrooms hour after hour, year after year. Despite student cries that such educational experiences are "depersonalizing" or "dehumanizing," the shortage of classroom space perpetuates the educational pattern: to accommodate the number of students, all classrooms simply must be used. Space for living, where students and faculty can meet and talk and work together, even for a few hours is extremely limited. Especially on a commuter campus, the educational design becomes quite restricted: large numbers of students attend classes and then disperse to all corners of the metropolitan area. It is not surprising, then, that many share the plea: let us rebuild the campus into human-sized neighborhoods of students and faculty.

Joint student and faculty interaction has arrived more quickly in University government than in curriculum design. All too often only an impersonal relationship exists between a student and a faculty member. Too frequently even the beginning of a meaningful dialogue about education, building together the educational experiences of a course or program, is absent. In this context the faculty member should play the role of an advanced student, being flexible and immediately responsive to student requests for conferences, seminars, lecture series and the like, as his and his student's educational adventures and probings require. Curriculum innovation in this sense implies constant student and faculty change, and a "home" on campus, even for commuting students.

The traditional goals of a college education are also being challenged. The traditional dichotomy between general and special education, between breadth and depth, may become specious and meaningless. Rather, the goal is an educational experience which is socially and emotionally and intellectually significant and satisfying; and the test is the way course content relates to the world of action and values. The proponent of this kind of educational program wishes to emphasize social values in addition to intellectual concepts. He looks favorably upon the community as a promising sphere for action; so that what at first seem to be collegiate defects — an urban location and a commuter student body — become, when viewed creatively, educational assets.

The evaluation of performance in a program with nontraditional goals must often differ from the standard grading system. What are the rewards and measurements for self-actualization and openness; for spontaneity, honesty, creativity, artistic-musical-literary-cinematic-dramatic expressiveness? Grades do not seem appropriate: they are accused of inhibiting learning and exploration, or confining the educational experience to pre-established achievement measures, of failing to reward seeking and thinking — in short, of preventing the student from acquiring the kind of education which he can significantly employ throughout his life. The University may be confronted with a barrage of evaluation devices different from those typically used in arriving at grades: student and faculty reports and papers, comments about field and travel experiences, student-faculty joint written assessments of strengths and weaknesses, etc.

The kind of educational enterprise described in the preceding paragraphs does not seem to be provided for in the extant machinery for introducing innovative courses. Nor does that machinery clearly provide for the introduction of total collegiate programs. Such ambitious programs may well be proposed even by faculty and students who prefer to operate along rather traditional lines. But especially for faculty who want to free themselves and their students for experimental programs quite different from those already noted in Section I-A of this report, there is no provision for campus space, for faculty salaries, for equipment and supplies, or for secretarial and assistant help.

II. Where Should We Go?

A. A proposal for change.

The University and all of its component parts must continue to be involved in an ongoing renaissance, rearranging courses, curricula, departments and colleges to meet the challenges of the future while building on the experiences of the past. This review and renaissance should take place

in three ways:

1. Development within existing colleges, schools, departments and programs.

a. Review. As has been almost universally the practice in the past, all aspects of the curriculum within the existing instructional units should continually undergo review, revision and renovation. Faculty must be allowed time to engage in educational development activities as a regular part of their duties instead of being forced to carry out such activities as an overload. This review should take place at every level:

(1) **Courses.** Rather than selecting content and forming objectives only when a course is first added to the curriculum faculty and students should undertake these tasks on a cyclic basis so that periodically every course is rejustified.

(2) **Curricula.** Similarly, departmental and college curricula should be reevaluated periodically. Departments, programs and schools should not insist upon required curricula so time consuming and tightly scheduled that they limit the educational opportunities of a substantial number of students.

(3) **Colleges.** Our individual colleges should continue to review their overall admission policies, distribution requirements and graduation requirements. Colleges as well as departments should be careful not to restrict learning possibilities with unnecessarily rigid requirements.

b. Pilot courses and curricula. Pilot or experimental sections of courses should be encouraged. The department responsible for any course which includes either more than 5 sections/year or 100 students/year should be encouraged to operate continually an experimental or pilot section of that course. Following an annual evaluation of this section, some of its most successful innovations could be incorporated into the regular course. Here graduate students, training to be college teachers, can be of substantial help. Indeed, one or more graduate students might be given the responsibility, under supervision, to develop and teach each pilot section.

In a similar manner departments might devise "pilot" major sequences, and colleges might develop diverse ways of enabling students to satisfy liberal education distribution requirements. For example, colleges might wish to consider proposing these two models which differ markedly from the current "n credits in each of x categories":

- (1) Students choosing this program must satisfy the faculty that they have met the spirit of the liberal education requirements by experiencing each of the 'Ways of Knowing' and each of the 'Subject-Matter Areas' as outlined by the Council on Liberal Education. Periodically each student must prepare a well-written essay outlining the progress he has made towards fulfilling the objectives of a liberal education and the plans he has made for the coming year.
- (2) Groups of teachers representing the diverse disciplines of a liberal education faculty shall organize 'distribution courses,' to be offered over 6 to 12 quarters which, when completed, would satisfy designated portions of a student's distribution requirements.

c. Intracollege experimental curricula. Many proposals for "experimental colleges" could actually be created and operated within the framework of an existing college. This should be true especially for Morris, Duluth and the College of Liberal Arts which draws its faculty widely from across the Twin Cities campus. CLA also has machinery for establishing interdisciplinary majors which could colesy approach many of the proposed experimental curricula.

To encourage the establishment of intracollege satellite "experimental colleges" and pilot programs, faculty and students of existing colleges of the University must be encouraged to re-examine their procedures for approving innovations in their curricula, their admissions policies, and their methods of student evaluation.

2. Establishment of new colleges within the University.

Faculty who feel they can no longer offer a proper course of study within one of the established colleges of the University can propose the establishment of a new college. Procedures for creating a new college, though tortuous and tedious, are well established. The initial proposal is made to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Once that committee recommends approval, the proposal must be approved by the University Senate, by the State Higher Education Coordinating Commission and approved by the Board of Regents. A new college was last established in 1964: the College of Biological Sciences.

3. Expansion of the role of University College.

There may be patterns of higher education which should be tried even though the faculty of no regular college of the University collectively feel that the effort should be a part of their responsibility. With no budgeted faculty of its own, and with the entire faculty of the University as potential participants, University College might expand its role to house experimental programs of collegiate scope. This expansion should in no way detract from its present mission.

a. Management. As the role of University College expands, it will need a full-time Dean and a larger administrative staff. In addition, a University College Governing Council should be established, replacing the existing University College Committee. This new Council should be nominated by the All-University Senate Committee on Committees, appointed by the President, and ratified by the Senate in the same way that other University Committees are appointed. The University College Governing Council, representing the faculty and students of the University, should present a report of its activities to the University Senate via the Senate Committee on Educational Policy at least once each year. Because they elect the members of the Senate Committee on Committees and the Senate, the faculty and students of the University would be able to influence the actions of the Council without crippling the implementation of possible far-out ideas for experimental curricula.

b. Origin of programs. Any group of University faculty or University faculty or students should be encouraged to present preliminary ideas about experimental programs to the UC Governing Council. The Council can then help guide and, perhaps, finance the conception of experimental programs, rather than merely react to completed proposals. In many for implementation. If there seems to be no convenient home for the new program, the UC Governing Council is authorized to implement the program within University College, subject to normal budgetary procedures.

The task of designing the final format for proposals should be left to the Council. In general, however, proposals should include a statement of educational objectives, procedures to be used to evaluate the program, how much student interest exists, how students are to be evaluated, and a budget. The procedures by which faculty will apply for reassignment to the experimental program, and the criteria which will be used to judge their applications, must also be stated.

c. Origin of faculty. Any regular, full-time member of the University of Minnesota faculty may be considered a member of the faculty of University College, and hence eligible to serve as a faculty member in an experimental program of collegiate scope. Since experimental programs within University College must, by their very nature, be tenuous and evanescent, their faculty must also be transitory. Because all regular faculty must first be hired by another college of the University, problems concerned with faculty retention and tenure can remain with the parent college.

d. Admissions. At the present time the University College admits only students who have already been accepted by another college of the University. This custom should be modified to permit them to admit any individual, including a freshman, to an approved University College program. Arrangements should be made between Admissions and Records and University College to establish the necessary machinery to handle University College admissions.

e. Full-collegiate programs. University College should be authorized to offer full collegiate or learning experiences. By their nature, however, all of its collegiate programs, formal courses, and other sorts of formal learning experiences must be experimental. To ensure that they remain so, their approval should include a built-in "destruct" clause, so that after a given number of years they would cease to exist. (One might expect a new proposal to grow out of an old experimental curriculum or course; where it has merit, such a proposal is to be encouraged.)

Programs which can be approved by University College should include,

but need not be limited to, full collegiate programs in which a student takes all of his undergraduate credits. The faculty of such approved programs, drawn from other colleges of the University, (1) can offer a full range of courses and other learning experiences, (2) are charged with assessing each student's performance, and (3) are charged with certifying that the student has reached a level of competence which deserves a bachelor's degree. In other words, the faculty and students in one of these programs may be considered a separate "college" except that it is temporary and it exists as a program in University College.

f. Examples of programs of collegiate scope. A number of types of experimental programs of collegiate scope might be imagined, including the following:

(1) **Work experience:** There is a real question whether it is desirable for a student to enter the University immediately after he completes high school. In the work-experience proposal, a student admitted to the program would spend a few weeks on campus in an orientation session. The University would help him find a job either in business or industry, or in a service field (as a teacher aide, as a social-work aide, in community relations, as an elected-official's aide, etc.) The student would work for two years, returning to the University only episodically, before beginning his formal higher education. After two years of work-experience, he would return to the University on a full-time basis. A specially structured curriculum might be necessary for these students.

(2) **Problem centered:** A number of centers have appeared on the campus during the past dozen years. An experimental program concerned with a particular problem could use the special resources and facilities of one of these centers. Thus an Urban Studies program might be nurtured by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs.

(3) **Research centered:** An entire curriculum might be structured around the research interests of faculty and students. Students would spend periods of time working with faculty (and graduate students) on research problems of mutual interest.

(4) **Mission oriented:** Under this scheme a number of new professionally oriented programs might be explored and evaluated. The program in the Training of Teacher Trainers serves as an example.

(5) **Student centered:** Rather than fulfilling a prescribed curriculum, each student might seek to design his own set of learning experiences. Lecture series and seminars would be formed whenever a group of students desired them. Each student would work with an advisor to draw up a contract which he would have to fulfill in order to complete the requirements for a degree.

4. Miscellaneous comments. Basic policies regulating grading, credits, and fees at present the responsibility of the University Senate, the central administration, and the Board of Regents rather than the individual colleges. It seems wise to insist that experimental programs of collegiate scope follow the same regulations imposed on other, regular colleges of the University, with minor modifications.

a. Grading. Many experimental programs will wish to try new methods of evaluating students' learning; such experimentation should be encouraged. Yet at this time, and perhaps for some time to come, a formal record of some sort which can be accepted by a more traditional college is necessary. Mindful of this situation, the University Senate at its meeting on March 9, 1967, adopted the following statement:

"The Senate wishes to encourage college faculties to experiment with grading systems or combinations of systems other than those explicitly defined by the action of the Senate. Accordingly, the faculties of several colleges are authorized to propose to the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing¹ experimental plans for grading which fall outside those plans currently approved by the Senate. If approval for a proposed experiment is given by the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing¹ the faculty making the proposal will be further authorized to proceed with this experiment for a period of 3 years. At the end of the three-year period, the plan will be reviewed by the Senate according to the procedures stipulated in item 7 for review of experiments with 'pass-no credit' grading."²

If this existing policy were amended by extending the 3-year limit, it should allow sufficient flexibility for experimental programs.

b. Credits. Faculty offering experimental programs of collegiate scope should insist that their students complete the equivalent of approximately 45 credits during a school year, and that the equivalent of 180 credits be earned before a Bachelor's degree is awarded. Faculty and students should be encouraged to imaginatively design courses which will award credits without the constriction of current practices. For example, it should be possible to award credits for work completed without giving grades. Credit by examination should also be encouraged.

c. Fees. Since a substantial portion of the University's resources derives from tuition and fees, students earning credits in an experimental program should pay fees comparable to those paid by other undergraduates.

d. Nomenclature. We should resist calling an approved experimental program of collegiate scope "The Experimental College," since one of the goals of this proposal is that several such programs operate simultaneously and independently. Perhaps each program might be named after a distinguished scholar or, if private funds were obtained, after a donor.

e. Student-faculty ratio. Because of the time required for educational development, most experimental and pilot programs will demand more faculty time and effort than do existing programs. Therefore, the student-faculty ratio applied to most undergraduate programs should not be applied to experimental programs. On the other hand, perhaps the greatest value of experimental programs is the possibility of replicating successful programs and incorporating them into the regular, nonexperimental curricula and colleges of the University. The Council should therefore resist approving programs which propose unreasonable student-faculty ratios.

B. A Plan for the Implementation of an Approved Experimental Program.

Once an experimental or pilot program has been approved as outlined in Section A, there remains yet one major hurdle: money. It seems unlikely that the University will receive in the foreseeable future all the funds it needs to carry out its educational mission in an optimal manner. Inasmuch as innovation and experimentation prevent stagnation, some experimental programs should be funded even at the expense of other, regular, ongoing, oversubscribed programs. Financial support will be needed for several facets of a program, including physical space, permanent equipment, operating supplies, salaries for supporting personnel such as teaching assistants and secretaries, and salaries for teaching faculty.

Too often in the past, new programs have been implemented by faculty willing to spend extra time without remuneration. Clearly, the need for experimental programs must be recognized when budgets are established. Therefore, the approval of a proposed experimental program should be contingent upon the presentation of a realistic budget which can support it. The proposed budget would be subject to normal review and approval procedures.

1. Physical space. Permanent space probably should not be provided for any given temporary program. Ideally, however, University College might eventually acquire permanent space including offices, conference rooms, and laboratories, which it could assign to temporary programs it was sheltering. In the interim, space must be found by making use of rooms during evening and weekend hours, or by renting facilities near the campus.

2. Permanent equipment and operating supplies. Funds for these items must be made available at the departmental, college, or university level, depending on the program. The University College Governing Council, through its Dean, should recommend budget items for programs being developed under its jurisdiction.

3. Supporting personnel. Salary money for supporting personnel such as secretaries, teaching assistants, and, where appropriate, outside "experts" must be made available. Should University College begin to shelter a number of experimental programs on a regular basis, it will obviously need funds for a permanent administration and civil service staff.

4. Faculty. As was emphasized earlier, faculty for experimental

programs must be recruited from regular, full-time faculty of the University. A faculty member cannot be expected to innovate and to spend substantial time developing new programs if these activities are added to a full-time load. Therefore, a method must be devised to permit him to reduce his regular duties and to devote his efforts instead of developing and teaching in an experimental program.

A faculty member who wishes to teach in an experimental program should apply to the administrators of that program. Once the application has been approved, it should be forwarded via the dean of the college sponsoring the experimental program to the chairman of the faculty members' department. The department chairman, following discussion with the faculty member, must forward the application with his recommendations to the faculty member's budgetary dean. The department chairman should include in his recommendation of approval or disapproval a discussion of the faculty member's ability to carry out a stated role in the experimental program, his expertise and professional competence in the experimental program; and the difficulties which will be created in his home department because of his absence. If the experimental program is housed in a different college (such as University College), the faculty member's budgetary dean will then negotiate with the dean of the host college to determine appropriate cross-charges and to resolve any possible difficulties or disagreements. Once a faculty member has been appointed to an experimental program, the administration of that program must report each year to the faculty member's department chairman, through the appropriate dean, so that the department chairman will have the best possible information on which to base promotion, tenure, and merit increases in salary.

A faculty member may initially request reassignment to an experimental program for as long as three years. He may seek renewal of his reassignment for additional years. The approved experimental program to which the faculty member is reassigned need not be in his department, division, or college.

Ordinarily, reassignment to an experimental program should be considered a privilege of the faculty in much the same sense as are single-quarter leaves and sabbatical furloughs. Because some faculty members may have unique and indispensable expertise, and because faculty members will eventually have to return to their home departments, their reassignment must be negotiated with their department chairmen and deans. Provision for reassignment should be made available only to full-time faculty holding regular appointments.

Ordinarily a faculty member will probably not request that all of his time be transferred to an experimental program. Most faculty members will undoubtedly wish to continue their research programs, to advise graduate students, and, perhaps, to teach graduate-level courses in their home departments while on reassignment to an experimental program. But since the reassigned faculty member will surely give up much of his regular teaching, counseling, and service duties, cross-charge funds must often be made available so that a temporary replacement teacher can be employed.

The three year term for initial reassignment is a compromise between the length of time necessary to design, implement, and evaluate an experimental program and the amount of hardship bearable by the parent department. It should be possible to negotiate additional years of reassignment towards the end of the initial term.

The Senate of the University of Minnesota urges that the faculty and students of the colleges of the University consider implementing the recommendations in section II which are pertinent to them. It hereby approves the following:

A. The policy concerning experimental grading systems as adopted by the Senate on March 9, 1967, shall be amended as follows:

For the sentences that read:

If approval for a proposed experiment is given by the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing the faculty making the proposal will be further authorized to proceed with this experiment for a period of 3 years. At the end of the three-year period, the plan will be reviewed by the Senate

Substitute:

If approval for a proposed experiment is given by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations the faculty making the proposal will be further authorized to proceed with this experiment for a stated period of time. If no definite period of time is stated, the authorization will be for 3 years. At the end of the stated period of time, or the three-year period, the plan will be reviewed by the Senate

B. Any regular full-time member of the faculty of the University of Minnesota may request reassignment to an approved experimental program for as long as three years, with renewal possible. The approved experimental program to which the faculty member is reassigned need not be in his department, division, or college. The procedure for reassignment is as follows:

1. Application is made to the administrators of an approved experimental program.

2. Once the application has been approved by the experimental program and by the Dean of the College serving as a host for the program, it shall be forwarded to the chairman of the faculty member's department.

3. The department chairman, following discussion with the faculty member, must forward the application with his recommendations of approval or disapproval to the faculty member's budgetary dean. The department chairman should include in his recommendation:

(a) a discussion of the faculty member's ability to carry out a stated role in the experimental program,

(b) his expertise and professional competence in the experimental program,

(c) the difficulties which will be created in his home department because of his absence.

4. The faculty member's budgetary dean will then negotiate with the dean of the host college to resolve any difficulties or disagreements and to determine appropriate cross-charges.

5. Once a faculty member has been appointed to an experimental program, the administrator of that program must report each year to the faculty member's department chairman, through the appropriate deans, so that the department chairman will have the best possible information on which promotion, tenure, and merit increases in salary.

C. The role of University College is expanded as follows:

1. All regular full-time members of the University of Minnesota faculty are considered members of the faculty of University College. They are represented in University College by the University College Governing Council, which shall serve as the voting faculty of University College.

The composition of the University College Governing Council shall be chosen so as to widely represent the regular undergraduate degree programs of the University, and will be appointed through the same procedures as are All-University Committees.

2. University College is authorized to admit prebaccalaureate students at any level, including freshmen. University College is authorized to offer up to and including full curricula leading to the Bachelor's degree, with the restriction that all courses and curricula remain experimental, each must, at the time of its approval, have attached to it an appropriate plan for evaluation and termination date.

3. University College may appoint only regular, full-time members of the faculty of the University to its regular teaching faculty. It may employ for a maximum of four years, an individual on a part-time or non-regular basis.

3. Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has approved and, with the concurrence of the Graduate School, reports the following Proposals of the Task Force on the Graduate School for information.

The Task Force members are agreed that qualified practitioners in an accepted discipline are the persons who should decide to whom and on what basis degrees should be awarded in that discipline. This agreement is qualified by the stipulation that decisions which affect other units than the discipline must be made at a level which will permit them to partici-

pate in the decision-making.

For this reason reorganization of the structure of the Graduate School is deemed desirable, both because the decision-making power is now centralized more than is necessary, and because the present group committee system, as it does not provide continuous representation for all major fields, is not adequate. The recommendations of the Task Force which deal with mechanisms of operation and organizational structure are designed both

¹ Since replaced by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations.

² University of Minnesota Senate Minutes, Year 1966-67, No. 5, P. 77.

to improve the functions of the Graduate School and to provide an atmosphere more amenable to change and further improvement. It is the hope of the committee that both the faculty and students will be able to realize through the newly restructured Graduate School an environment for graduate educational experience sensitive to the needs of society and responsive to the need for continued flexibility and change. Additionally, it is anticipated that with the increasing size of the Graduate School the proposed structure will be better able to handle the increased volume of paperwork.

The recommendations of the Task Force involve a modification of the present system, and a redistribution of some of the responsibilities of the Group Committees and of the Graduate School Office. This calls for the organization of the graduate faculty in the major fields into what the Task Force has chosen to call "Units." These Units (which might consist of a single field or of two or more in association) will be made up of the graduate faculty members representing the graduate major fields in that particular Unit and they will assume many of the responsibilities presently borne by the Graduate Group Committees, including, for example, the review of individual student programs, petitions, thesis proposals and committee appointments, within basic guidelines established by the Dean of the Graduate School. The Group Committee system itself will be expanded to provide continuous representation for each major field, and will be given major new responsibilities. It is recommended that fields, Units, and Groups make provision for graduate student representation in discussions leading to general review and policy formulation.

Aside from the redistribution of certain responsibilities to the Unit level, the most important aspect of these recommendations is that the Group Committees become involved in periodic intensive reviews of all graduate degree programs, covering all aspects of their operation. The Group Committee of which the field is a part will be expected to review the curriculum, to assess the faculty and students and the facilities available. It will also be expected to look at among other things the relationship between the resources of the field and the size of its graduate program. Where appropriate the inclusion of outside consultants and student representatives should be encouraged. On the basis of the considerations of the Group Committee, a decision will be made as to whether the program is operating well, and, if necessary, steps to correct deficiencies can be recommended to the Dean.

A brief outline of the way in which the Task Force feels this reorganization might be accomplished is attached.

- | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| Francis M. Boddy | Karl Potter |
| Raymond O. Collier | Clarence M. Stowe |
| Virgil Hoftiezer | John W. Webb |
| Warren E. Ibele | Albert K. Wickesberg |
| Albert J. Linck | Cecil Wood |
| Lloyd H. Lofquist, Chairman | Leslie Zieve |
| William E. Parham | |

I. We recommend the expansion of the present Group Committee system to a total of (for example) from 10 to 20 Groups made up of related major fields, and providing for continuous representation on a committee for all major fields.

A. These Groups will be defined initially by an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School. The *ad hoc* committee will take into account the preferences for group assignment of the graduate faculty in each major field.

B. Once the groups have been defined a representative to serve on the Group Committee for each graduate program will be selected by procedures established by the graduate faculty of each field. These procedures will be reported to the Dean of the Graduate School. The Dean of the Graduate School will appoint a chairman for each Group from among the members elected. These chairmen will be members of the Executive Committee of the Graduate School.

C. The first task of a Group will be to work with the graduate faculty in the various major fields of which it is comprised to establish the Units.

1. These Units will be established so as to provide for homogeneity of interests combined with sufficient heterogeneity of outlook to assure full discussion and a multiplicity of viewpoints.

2. The Groups will make the decisions as to how Units will be organized, after consulting with them. Comparable criteria and procedures for making these decisions should be employed by various Groups such that organization is consistently determined from one Group to another. If the graduate faculty in a program wishes to change its association at a future date a new proposal can be submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School.

D. The Group Committees can also recommend to the Dean revision of Unit definitions, restructuring of Units or changes in Unit functions.

II. We recommend the following distribution of responsibilities:

A. Responsibilities of the Unit:

1. Recommendations which will be made by the Units and transmitted directly to the Dean of the Graduate School include:

a. Individual student items:

- 1) Degree programs and changes in programs
- 2) Thesis topics and changes in thesis topics
- 3) Extensions of time
- 4) Appointment of or changes in examining committees
- 5) Petitions for changes in the above items

b. Admissions decisions:

- 1) The Dean will publish the current general rules and policies for admission to the Graduate School.
- 2) The Units will state the standards they will apply in their fields.
- 3) Units will decide on each application and return it to the Dean for review. If the Dean disagrees with a decision by a Unit, he may consult with the Unit to resolve the individual case. Following consultation the Unit will review the case and forward its decision to the Dean. If the Dean does not concur procedures in item 4 will be invoked.
- 4) If the Dean determines that a Unit is departing significantly from established standards in their admissions decisions he will call for a special review by the appropriate Group Committee of the admissions standards in the Unit, and may at the same time instruct admissions personnel to cease admitting marginal students until the results of the review are known. The Group Committee will make a recommendation to the Dean and he will determine what action should be taken.

2. Recommendations which will be made by the Units and be reported to the Group Committees for their concurrence before final approval by the Dean:

- a. Approval of new graduate level courses
- b. Approval of nominations to the graduate faculty
- c. Modifications (or abolition) of general requirements for a degree

B. Group Committee responsibilities:

1. The most important will be the periodic review of graduate degree programs.

a. Reports of these reviews will be made to the Dean of the Graduate School, to the graduate faculty in the Unit and to other relevant deans.

b. It is suggested that the Dean of the Graduate School be

represented ex officio on the review committees.

c. It is also suggested, that submission of a written report of the results of a review be made mandatory.

2. Review of new or modified degree programs and curricula
3. New or modified structures and procedures

C. Executive Committee:

1. The Executive Committee of the Graduate School serves as an advisory body to the Dean with respect to University-wide Graduate School matters.

IXa. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

Reported for Action

Resolution for the establishment of a new University committee in accordance with Article IV, No. 3a, of the Constitution and Bylaws.

The Senate Committee on Committees recommends to the Senate the establishment of the University Committee on Educational Development, to report to the Senate through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. The University Committee on Educational Development, to be appointed by usual procedures, will consist of 7 faculty and 3 students chosen from the entire University. Committee members will be selected, in part, to represent the concerns and interests of the Council on Liberal Education, the Graduate School Executive Committee, and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. The Vice-President for Academic Administration, or his designate, will serve as an ex-officio member of this Committee. The functions of the University Committee on Educational Development will be:

1. To develop detailed guidelines and operating procedures for the Educational Development Program, consistent with policy established by the Senate;
2. To report annually to the Senate on the status of and plans for the Educational Development Program and to recommend to the Senate, through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, and policy changes suggested in the light of experience with the Program;
3. To assist the Vice-President for Academic Administration in his review of departmental and collegiate reports on and proposals for educational development projects; and
4. To review and recommend action on proposals for educational development efforts submitted directly to the Vice-President for Academic Administration from any part or any level of the University.

NEAL R. AMUNDSON
Chairman

X. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

1. Reported for Action

The work of the Committee on Business and Rules this year has been directed toward developing supplementary procedures or modifying present procedures to assist the Senate and its committees in accomplishing their objectives. The following proposals are recommended for approval by the Senate. If adopted, they will be inserted in the Senate Handbook in appropriate sections, with resulting renumbering or other editorial modifications as needed.

1. In the University Senate and all of its committees, standing or special, the motion to table shall be debatable.

Rationale: Under common parliamentary procedure, the motion to table is not debatable. One result of following this procedure is that debate may be ended by the simple majority vote required to pass the motion to table, although the long standing tradition in American deliberative bodies is that a two-thirds majority is required to end debate. (The motion for the previous question, which is the appropriate motion to end debate and which is not itself debatable, requires two-thirds.) The committee believes that the Senate's interests would be best served by having the motion to table debatable so that argument for and against tabling can be heard. If a member wishes to end debate, he should move to close debate ("the previous question") on either the main motion, an amendment, or a motion to table, and obtain a two-thirds majority.

2. The quorum for Senate committees, standing or special, shall be a majority of the members.

Rationale: This is in accordance with usual parliamentary procedure, but a specific statement on the matter in the Senate Handbook brings it directly to the attention of the committees. A committee needs to know under what conditions it may do business.

3. Each Senate committee, standing or special may determine for itself who may be present at its meetings other than duly appointed or elected members of the committee and may make its own rules of procedure.

Rationale: Of course a committee must have authority to control its own meetings and this statement is directed toward reinforcing that principle. If a committee votes to admit non-members, it may determine what participation if any is to be accorded them. Even when non-members are permitted to be present, a committee may move to executive session for part of a meeting. Included among non-members in these procedures are representatives of the press.

Among the issues to be considered in determining the attendance of non-members, especially representatives of the press, is the committee's need to bring its proposals to a certain stage of development before they are released to the public. On the other hand, many issues benefit from public hearings as a procedure for developing committee positions. It is for a committee to decide when public meetings are needed and at what time its recommendations are ready for consideration by others.

4. The Senate meeting room shall provide a clear and definite identification of the area reserved for Senators; no non-Senator (except authorized alternate) shall have access to the Senate floor except with the explicit permission of the chair. There shall be a system for identifying Senators (or authorized alternates) in order to permit their seating and appropriate voting.

Rationale: With the broader attendance now possible at Senate meetings (any faculty member or student), the room arrangements must be somewhat more formal and more carefully controlled than was previously necessary.

5. If the chairman of a Senate committee, standing or special, or, in his absence, a single member designated by him, is not a Senator, such chairman or member shall be extended the privileges of the Senate floor, including making motions, in connection with a report of his committee or any activity of the Senate which pertains to the business of his committee. He may not vote, however.

Rationale: A committee's ability to serve the Senate is severely limited if the committee chairman can not engage directly in the parliamentary maneuvers often necessary to protect and further the interests of his committee. Presentation of the committee report, handling amendments and other challenges, and general representation of the committee's purposes require that the chairman be authorized to make motions. This proposal is a bylaw change and should be acted on by the Senate under rules governing bylaw changes.

6. In Senate deliberations, priority of recognition shall ordinarily be given to Senators (and chairmen of committees) over non-Senators.

Rationale: The Senate constitution states that non-Senators may speak "at the discretion of the Senate" and this positive, operational statement seems to follow directly from that provision.

2. Constitution—Morris Campus
Reported for Information

The Constitution of the University Senate provides (Article III, Section 2) that "Each Campus shall determine its own assembly and shall adopt its own Constitution and Bylaws which shall be consistent with the Constitution and Bylaws of the University Senate."

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
OF MORRIS, MINNESOTA

Preamble

The University of Minnesota, Morris is a liberal arts campus of the University of Minnesota, subject to the control of the Board of Regents. General policies of the University, including those implemented through the University Senate, shall apply to the University of Minnesota, Morris,

except those that by the nature of the separate location of the campus are not applicable. The educational concerns and responsibilities of the campus are committed to the Provost and the Morris Campus Assembly as herein provided.

Article I. Administration

Section 1. The President of the University

The President of the University as its chief executive officer has general administrative authority over University affairs. He may suspend action taken by the Morris Campus Assembly and ask for a reconsideration of such action. If the President and the Morris Campus Assembly do not reach agreement on the action, the question may be appealed to the Board of Regents by either party.

Section 2. Vice President for Coordinate Campuses and Educational Relationships

The Office of the Vice President for Coordinate Campuses and Educational Relationships provides a coordinating function for the initiation, review, and interpretation of policies and procedures in their applicability to the Morris Campus.

Section 3. Senior Administrative Officer of the Morris Campus

The senior administrative officer, hereafter referred to as the Provost, shall be the chief representative and executive officer of the Morris Campus. He shall have administrative authority over campus affairs. He shall be responsible for introducing and testing the improvement of educational ideas and proposals, formulating policy, stimulating, and conducting discussion leading to the improvement of the educational program. His responsibilities shall include both strengthening the campus and its program and explaining that program to the University and the community.

Section 4. Budget

The Provost, as chief executive officer of the campus, shall be responsible for the expenditure of funds and shall have final authority to make budgetary recommendations to the President of the University. However, in view of the necessary consideration of educational policies and objectives involved, he shall consult with and ask for the recommendations of appropriate persons concerning such budgetary matters as materially affect the campus as a whole.

Section 5. Selection of Administrative Officers

In the appointment of principal administrative officers whose duties materially affect the educational program, the Provost shall make his recommendations to the President of the University after consultation with appropriate members of the campus community. The organization of such administrative offices shall be done in consultation with the campus community.

Article II. Divisions

Section 1. Organization

The Division shall be the basic organizational unit of the campus and shall consist of its professors, associate professors, assistant professors (including research associates), instructors (including research fellows), lecturers, part-time faculty, teaching specialists, and other members the Division may choose to elect or appoint.

Section 2. Division Chairmen

A. Duties and Responsibilities: The Chairman is the official representative and administrative officer of the Division. He shall be responsible for the formulation of Divisional policies and the execution of University and campus policies insofar as they concern the Division. He shall call and preside over Division meetings, be generally responsible for the organization and quality of the work of the Division, report on teaching and research of the Division faculty, prepare the budget and be responsible for the expenditure of Divisional funds in consultation with members of the Division. He shall introduce proposals and stimulate and conduct discussions directed toward the improvement of the educational program and shall consult with members of the Division, and when appropriate, other individuals and groups on all matters of common concern.

B. Appointment: In the appointment of a Division Chairman, the Provost shall make his nomination to the President, after consultation with the faculty and others as specified in the By-Laws. The appointment of a Division Chairman shall be for a term of five years. A Chairman will be eligible for reappointment.

Section 3. Meetings

Each Division shall hold at least one meeting each quarter. Special meetings may be called by the Division Chairman. At the request of three or more members of the Division, the Division Chairman shall call a meeting of the Division within seven days. Agendas of regular and special meetings of the Division shall be prepared by the Chairman and normally shall be distributed in advance to all members of the division and to the office of the Provost.

The Division members shall advise the Division Chairman on matters of common concern, such as faculty positions, curriculum, budget, special programs, and policies of the Division.

Article III. The University of Minnesota, Morris Campus Assembly

Section 1. Organization and Membership

The Morris Campus Assembly shall include the faculty, elected student members, the Business Manager, civil service personnel holding the title of Director, and elected civil service members. For purposes of this Constitution, faculty, students, and civil service personnel are defined as follows:

A. Faculty: The faculty of the University of Minnesota, Morris, consists of its professors, associate professors, assistant professors (including research associates), instructors (including research fellows), lecturers, part-time faculty holding at least one-third equivalent of a full-time position for the academic year, and teaching specialists.

B. Students: Students eligible for election to membership are those students who have earned 24 credits in residence, and who are enrolled for 9 or more credits during the quarter in which the election for student Assembly members takes place. Student members of the Assembly must carry at least nine credits during each quarter of their term of office.

C. Civil Service: Any member of the campus community holding at least a nine-month civil service appointment is eligible for election to membership in the Assembly. The Business Manager and civil service personnel holding the title of Director are members, by virtue of their appointments, of the Campus Assembly. Other civil service personnel are eligible for election to the Campus Assembly.

D. All voting members of committees that have Business on the Assembly floor are eligible to participate in the discussion of that business and to vote on it.

Section 2. Election of Student and Civil Service Members of the Assembly

A. One student member shall be elected at large by the student body for each 100 students or major fraction thereof enrolled fall quarter.

B. One civil service member shall be elected at large by the civil service staff for each 50 civil service personnel or major fraction thereof employed fall quarter.

C. Elections shall take place during the spring quarter for the ensuing academic year.

Section 3. Officers

A. The Provost of the campus shall be the Chairman of the Campus Assembly.

B. A Vice Chairman shall be elected by the Campus Assembly. He shall be a voting member of the Campus Assembly and shall preside in the absence of the Provost or when the Provost takes the floor.

C. A Secretary shall be elected by the Campus Assembly. He shall be a voting member of the Campus Assembly.

1. The Secretary shall keep minutes of all meetings of the Campus Assembly. The minutes shall be subject to additions and corrections by the Campus Assembly only.

2. Within four weeks following each meeting of the Campus Assembly, the Secretary shall distribute the minutes to the members of the Campus Assembly, to the Office of the Provost, and to the clerk of the University Senate. Minutes will be made available to the entire campus community.

D. A Parliamentarian shall be elected by the Campus Assembly. He shall be a voting member of the Campus Assembly. He shall advise the chair on the propriety of actions according to the rules of procedure adopted

ed by the Campus Assembly. Where there is not an explicit rule of procedure or where interpretation is in doubt, Robert's Rules of Order, Revised shall govern.

E. The Vice Chairman, Secretary, and Parliamentarian shall be elected at a spring quarter Campus Assembly meeting, held after the student and civil service elections, to serve for the ensuing academic year. Each is eligible for re-election. Vacancies shall be filled by special elections.

Section 4. Meetings

A. The Campus Assembly shall meet at least once each quarter of the academic year.

B. Special meetings of the Campus Assembly may be called by the Provost or the Executive Committee. Upon the request of ten percent of the voting members of the Campus Assembly, the Executive Committee shall call the Campus Assembly into session within seven days.

C. Agendas of regular and special meetings of the Campus Assembly shall be prepared by the Executive Committee and normally shall be distributed to all members of the Campus Assembly at least seven days before such meetings. All members of the campus community may submit business to the Executive Committee for its consideration as agenda items. Copies of the agenda will be made available to the entire campus community.

D. Meetings of the Campus Assembly are open to all members of the campus community unless an executive session is declared.

Section 5. Executive Session

The Campus Assembly may by majority vote declare an executive session wherein only members of the Assembly and voting members of committees with business on the Assembly floor shall be present.

Section 6. Quorum

A simple majority of the membership of the Campus Assembly shall constitute a quorum.

Section 7. Powers

The Campus Assembly, as the policy-making and legislative body shall exercise the general legislative authority and responsibility in educational matters concerning the Morris Campus delegated to it by the University Senate and the Board of Regents. These powers and responsibilities would generally include the following:

A. To establish appropriate policy, procedures, and regulations governing the educational aspects of the campus program. This would generally include the following areas of concern: curriculum, honors, functions, admissions, graduation, teacher education, athletics, student activities, awards, financial aid, student behavior, and campus events, but not the recommendation of students for graduation or graduation with honors—a power which is reserved for the faculty.

B. The Campus Assembly has the power of review over policy governing the library and housing. Policies developed and established through the Library and Housing Committees can be approved or disapproved by the Campus Assembly.

C. To establish and review the actions of standing and ad hoc committees of the Campus Assembly.

D. To review the actions of the Executive Committee.

E. To receive and discuss reports from the Provost and other administrative officers of the campus or to request such reports on matters affecting the campus.

F. To discuss and act upon any measure or question appropriate to the legislative body of the campus.

G. To delegate any of the above powers.

Article IV. Executive Committee of the Campus Assembly

Section 1. Organization

The Executive Committee shall consist of eight members, including the Provost as Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and Secretary of the Campus Assembly. In addition, two faculty members, two student Assembly members, and one civil service Assembly member shall be elected by the Campus Assembly to the Executive Committee. Members of this Committee shall be elected at a spring quarter Assembly meeting and shall serve for one year with the possibility of re-election. Members elected to the Executive Committee assume their duties as committee members at the start of the new academic year following their election, with the exception provided for in the By-Laws.

Section 2. Powers

The Executive Committee shall have the following powers and responsibilities:

A. To recommend membership and designate the chairmen of the standing committees of the Campus Assembly during the spring quarter for the ensuing academic year, in accordance with the By-Laws.

B. To prepare agendas for and call meetings of the Campus Assembly.

C. To receive and coordinate reports and recommendations for action by the Campus Assembly.

D. To request reports and information for the Campus Assembly.

E. To apprise appropriate committees or the Campus Assembly of any matter the Committee considers worthy of deliberation.

F. To offer to the President of the University, the services of the campus community for purposes of consultation in the selection of a Provost for the campus.

G. To carry out other functions delegated by the Campus Assembly.

Article V. Consultative Committee

Section 1. Organization

A. There shall be a Campus Consultative Committee consisting of four faculty members (The Provost, Assistant Provost, Academic Dean and Division Chairmen shall not be eligible for membership); four students and four civil service members (the Business Manager and personnel holding the title of Director shall not be eligible for membership).

B. The Campus Consultative Committee shall consist of three subcommittees: The Faculty Consultative Subcommittee, the Student Consultative Subcommittee and the Civil Service Consultative Subcommittee. Each subcommittee shall select its own chairman.

C. Except as in E and F below, elected members of the Consultative Committee do not represent constituencies but are to act in the best interests of the entire community of the University of Minnesota, Morris.

D. The Campus Consultative Committee shall elect its own chairman.

E. The Campus-Consultative Committee may deem that particular matters of business can be handled best by the constituent-represented subcommittees or by individual members of the committee.

F. The individual has the right to select the subcommittee or the individuals on the committee to whom he will submit his business.

G. The terms of office for faculty and civil service members shall be two years with a maximum of three consecutive terms. The term of office for student members shall be one year. Elections shall be held in the spring in accordance with the by-laws. Interim vacancies shall be filled by special elections.

Section 2. Powers

The Campus Consultative Committee shall have the following powers and responsibilities:

A. To discuss with appropriate members of the Campus Community special problems including those relating to instruction, research, personnel, service functions, student affairs and finances.

B. To facilitate communication between the faculty, students, civil service personnel, the Provost and other U.M.M. administrators and the Senate Consultative Committee.

Article VI. Administrative Committee

Section 1. Organization

The Administrative Committee shall consist of the Provost, the Division Chairmen, and such other members the Provost may wish to appoint.

Section 2. Responsibilities

The Administrative Committee shall advise the Provost on matters affecting the administration of the campus.

Article VII. Standing Committees of the Campus Assembly

Section 1. Organization

The Campus Assembly may establish standing committees to assist in the discharge of its responsibilities.

Section 2. Membership

shall fill interim vacancies by appointment.

The membership of all standing committees of the Campus Assembly shall be recommended by the executive committee in accordance with the provisions of this Constitution and the By-Laws. The Executive Committee

Section 3. Meetings

A. A chairman shall call meetings as often as required to discharge committee responsibilities. A special meeting shall be called if requested by two or more committee members.

B. Standing committees shall submit a written report of its actions to the Campus Assembly at least once during the academic year.

C. Minutes of all standing committee meetings shall be filed in the Office of the Provost.

D. A quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the voting membership of each standing committee.

Section 4. Term of Office

Membership on a standing committee shall be for one year, with no restrictions on the number of consecutive terms.

Article VIII. Ad Hoc Committees

The Campus Assembly or the Provost may establish ad hoc committees to undertake special charges which do not fall within the purview of the standing committees of the Campus Assembly. Ad hoc committees normally shall observe the same operational procedures as specified for the standing committees.

Article IX. Reports

A permanent file of the minutes of all meetings of Divisions, campus committees, and the Campus Assembly shall be maintained by the Office of the Provost. This file shall normally be accessible to all members of the Campus Assembly.

Article X. Procedure for Amending the Constitution and By-Laws

The Campus Assembly may amend this Constitution by a two-thirds majority vote of its voting membership, and the By-Laws by a simple majority vote of its voting membership, providing that a proposed amendment has been presented at a previous meeting of the Campus Assembly and has been distributed to the voting members at least two weeks prior to the vote on its adoption.

BY-LAWS

Article I. Standing Committees

Section 1. Selection of Membership

The Executive Committee shall recommend the membership of the standing committees to the Campus Assembly for ratification in accordance with the following provisions:

A. Standing committees shall be appointed in the spring to serve for the ensuing academic year.

B. The Executive Committee shall consult with the Division Chairmen and the student members of the Student Affairs Committee in addition to consulting with the campus community before making its recommendations to the Campus Assembly.

Section 2. Curriculum Committee

A. Organization

The Curriculum Committee shall consist of thirteen members, including the Division Chairmen, four faculty, three students, the Academic Dean, and a civil service member from the Records Office. The member from the Records Office and the Academic Dean shall serve without vote. A quorum shall consist of six voting members.

B. Powers

The Curriculum Committee shall develop and recommend curricular policy. It shall receive and study curricular proposals and shall seek ways to improve the curriculum.

Section 3. Teacher Education Committee

A. Organization

The Teacher Education Committee shall consist of ten members, including six faculty members, three students, and the Chairman of the Division of Education or his representative. The Chairman of the Division of Education or his representative will serve as an ex officio member without vote. A quorum shall consist of five voting members.

B. Powers

The Teacher Education Committee shall develop, recommend, and interpret policy governing the Teacher Education Program. It shall periodically review the objectives and procedures of the program including student teaching and teacher certification.

Section 4. Scholastic Committee

A. Organization

The Scholastic Committee shall consist of eleven members, including six faculty members, three students, a member appointed by the Provost, and a civil service member from the Records Office. The member appointed by the Provost, who shall act as administrative assistant and secretary, and the member from the Records Office, shall serve without vote. A quorum shall consist of five voting members.

There will be a subcommittee on admissions, responsible to the Scholastic Committee, which will admit students and evaluate transfer credit in accordance with standards established by the Campus Assembly.

B. Powers

The Scholastic Committee shall develop, recommend and interpret scholastic policy and it shall provide for the enforcement of academic regulations. It shall be concerned with such matters as admission standards, graduation requirements, advanced standing, accreditation, teacher certification, academic probation, and academic dismissal from the University. The committee may make exceptions to academic regulations if in spirit such regulations are satisfied and if the strict application of policy would impose an educational disadvantage or an undue hardship on the student.

Section 5. Library Committee

A. Organization

The Library Committee shall consist of eight members, including five faculty members, two students, and the librarian. The librarian as an ex officio member shall serve without vote. A quorum shall consist of four voting members.

B. Powers

The Library Committee shall advise the librarian in the development and establishment of policy covering the library. The librarian shall inform the committee on all policy matters. The members of the committee shall introduce for committee consideration any item that is related to the operation of the library.

Section 6. Intercollegiate Athletic Committee

A. Organization

The Intercollegiate Athletic Committee shall consist of ten members, including five faculty members, three students, the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics and the Business Manager. The Director of Intercollegiate Athletics and the Business Manager shall serve as ex officio members without vote. One faculty member from the committee shall be designated as the faculty athletic representative. A quorum shall consist of five voting members.

B. Powers

The Intercollegiate Athletic Committee shall develop, recommend, and interpret athletic policy, and it shall provide for the enforcement of regulations governing intercollegiate athletics. It shall coordinate the athletic programs of the campus.

Section 7. Functions and Awards Committee

A. Organization

The Functions and Awards Committee shall consist of eight members, including four faculty members, three students, and the Director of University Relations. A quorum shall consist of five members.

B. Powers

The Functions and Awards Committee shall develop and recommend awards for scholarship and special merit.

The Committee shall also supervise honors convocations, Cap and Gown Day, graduation, and other academic events.

Section 8. Financial Aids Committee

A. Organization

The Financial Aids Committee shall consist of twelve members, including five faculty members, four students, a civil service employee who does not hold the title of Director, the Business Manager, and a member from the Office of Admissions and Scholarships. The Business Manager and the member from the Office of Admissions and Scholarships shall serve as ex officio members without vote. A quorum shall consist of six voting members.

B. Powers

The Financial Aids Committee shall develop and recommend financial

aids policy, and it shall provide for the implementation of the financial aid programs.

Section 9. Student Affairs Committee

A. Organization

The Student Affairs Committee shall consist of eleven members, including four faculty members, five students, one civil service employee who does not hold the title of Director or Business Manager, and the Director of Student Activities. The student members shall be elected by the student body for one-year terms. The Director of Student Activities shall serve as an ex officio member without vote. A quorum shall consist of six voting members.

B. Powers

The Student Affairs Committee shall develop and recommend policy covering student activities. It shall have the power to grant recognition to student organizations, and to approve the constitutions and by-laws of such organizations. The student members shall recommend to the Executive Committee students for membership on standing committees of the Campus Assembly. It shall develop and implement rules and procedures for student elections.

Section 10. Student Behavior Committee

A. Organization

The Student Behavior Committee shall consist of seven members, including three faculty members, three students and a representative appointed by the Provost, who shall serve as secretary of the committee without vote. A quorum shall consist of four voting members.

B. Powers

The Student Behavior Committee shall develop, recommend, and implement student behavior policy, and it shall provide for the enforcement of procedures and regulations to maintain appropriate standards of conduct within the student community.

Section 11. Housing Committee

A. Organization

The Housing Committee shall consist of twelve members, including three faculty members, five students who live on campus, three students who live off campus, and the Director of Housing. The Director of Housing shall serve as an ex officio member without vote. A quorum shall consist of six voting members.

B. Powers

The Housing Committee shall advise the Housing Director in the development and establishment of policy covering housing. The Housing Director shall inform the committee on all policy matters. The members of the committee shall introduce for committee consideration any item that is related to the operation of the Housing Office.

Section 12. Morris Campus Union Board

A. Organization

The Morris Campus Union Board shall consist of eleven members, including one faculty member from each of the four Divisions, five students, one civil service member, and a representative from the Office of Student Activities who shall serve as an ex officio member without vote. A quorum shall consist of six voting members.

B. Powers

The Morris Campus Union Board shall develop and recommend policy for the scheduling and programming of campus events, activities, and programs which are initiated by student organizations or by the Office of Student Activities. The Board shall advise on policies covering the scheduling and programming of all extracurricular activities on the campus.

Section 13. Honor Case Commission

A. Organization

The Honor Case Commission shall consist of six members, including five students and a faculty advisor who shall serve without a vote. A quorum shall consist of three voting members.

B. Powers

The Honor Case Commission shall develop and recommend policy, and shall implement procedures appropriate to the operation of the Honors System.

Section 14. Seminar-Honors Program Committee

A. Organization

The Seminar-Honors Program Committee shall consist of nine members, including four faculty, four students, and a representative of the Academic Dean who shall serve without vote. A quorum shall consist of five voting members.

B. Powers

The Seminar-Honors Program Committee shall advise the Seminar-Honors Program Director in the development and the establishment of program policies. The Seminar-Honors Program Director shall inform the committee on all policy matters. The members of the committee shall introduce for consideration any item that is related to the operation of the Seminar-Honors Program.

Article II. Election of Executive and Consultative Committee Members

The Executive Committee shall be elected in the spring quarter from and by the Campus Assembly. They shall take office immediately for the purpose of the formulation of committees, and for the ensuing academic year for all other functions. Each vacancy shall be filled by separate elections. A simple majority of the Assembly is required to elect.

Section 2.

The Faculty, Student, and Civil Service Consultative Committees shall be elected in the spring by each of the constituencies to serve for their respective terms. The constituencies will determine their own election procedures. Interim vacancies shall be filled by special elections.

Article III. Selection of Division Chairmen

In implementing the constitutional provision for consultation with the faculty in the selection of a Division Chairman, the Provost shall appoint a committee to assist and advise him in his choice. The committee shall include at least three members from the Division concerned, the Chairman of another Division, and the Chairman of the Faculty Consultative Committee. If the Chairman of the Faculty Consultative Committee is a member of the Division concerned, he shall designate another member of the Faculty Consultative Committee to serve in his place. With the concurrence of the Division concerned, non-faculty members may be added to this committee. After consultation with the members of the Division concerned and the administration, the committee shall make its recommendations to the Provost.

ROGER B. PAGE

Chairman

XI. SENATE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

Two applications have been made to the Senate Judicial Committee for hearings.

The first was considered during the academic year 1968-1969 but was not reported to the Senate because the application for a hearing was still pending at the end of the year. Subsequently an agreed settlement was reached through the good offices of the National Secretary of the American Association of University Professors and the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Freedom of the Minnesota Chapter. The individual concerned has accepted a position in another university, and this University has paid salary for an additional academic year after termination of services. The complaint charged that ambiguities in a statement concerning eligibility for tenure in the Department Chairman's letter offering the position had justified expectations which were not satisfied by the actual terms of a special contract drafted later. The case does not reflect a weakness in the Regulations concerning Faculty Tenure, but should be taken by chairmen and directors as an indication of the care which should be taken in initial tenders to make the terms and procedure of appointment explicitly clear.

The second case is still under consideration by the Judicial Committee and will be the subject of a later report.

CHARLES H. McLAUGHLIN

Chairman

XII. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Reported for Information

The University Committee on Extension and Community Programs has

been meeting regularly during the academic year 1969-70. Initially the committee activities were devoted to an examination of the wide range of extension activities already underway within the university community and subsequently the committee has devoted attention to the appropriate role of continuing education activities within our educational framework. The committee has developed a draft of a policy paper which states that continuing education activities should be an integral part of the educational mission of the various collegiate units within the University of Minnesota. An excerpt from this draft follows.

"The University should extend its present program of day school and extension offerings to the community, but this is at best an inadequate concept of our responsibility for the education of adults. The weakness of much higher adult education lies in its traditional curricula and delivery of instruction—lack of the imagination that creates new approaches to the education of adults.

"Countless faculty members at this University have taught and worked with adults in extension programs. Some have reworked traditional courses to meet adult needs and, as a result, have found that their experiments can be reintroduced into day courses. Many have been willing to bring their professional talents out of the classroom into the TV studio; the conference milieu; the multi-directional, state-wide, telephone discussion; the seminar in which adult students are often peers. The classic lecture delivery of many a faculty member has undergone abrupt change as adult students on the firing line have challenged statements and forced exchange of ideas in fluid teaching-learning formats.

"Continuing education should however become a part of the mainstream in all departments and colleges of the University. A planned, programmatic response by departments to the opportunities and obligations present in continuing education is seen as a necessary part of their commitment to the total educational task. The concept of life-long education denies the belief that the four year baccalaureate degree program, or even graduate degree programs, can be separated from the total process of education and identified as the one area of legitimate concern of the faculty.

"The University is uniquely able to do well certain things that cannot be done by other institutions or agencies of higher education. We also have specific needs, particularly in graduate training programs, which can be served by active participation in continuing education. However, we need not assume that we can or should respond to all needs nor plan or program for all social changes. A university must actively study the educational needs of communities and of individual adults. In these needs it finds not only new ideas where education should be provided but also the seeds of new subject matter and research problems. All the activities that bring the University into vital interaction with society should be viewed together. This is possible only if these activities are joined in a coordinated, vital unit, adequately funded to support the job that needs to be done. Coordination with other institutions and agencies is required as well, possibly through an agency of the Higher Education Coordinating Commission.

"As a community of scholars, we have devoted too little attention to the problem. Evaluation and research on higher education is limited, if not scarce. We know very little about the dimension of need or the most effective systems of response. However, it may be judged that research and evaluation on continuing education would have salutary effects on all of higher education. Certainly it is a legitimate area of scholarly inquiry."

In due course this policy statement will be submitted through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to the Senate for appropriate debate.

At the present time the Committee on Extension and Community Programs is considering various organizational structures which would provide suitable vehicles for effectively implementing the proposed policies.

R. A. SWALIN
Chairman

XIII. REPORT, UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SUMMER SESSIONS, 1969-70

Reported for Information

The Committee, in its 1969-70 deliberations, concerned itself with three major activities:

1. The development of a new Summer Session tuition structure which relates tuition charges to credit hours taken. After an extended series of discussions and revisions, the tuition schedule was approved by the Board of Regents.

2. Approval of a proposal, to be sent to appropriate University of Minnesota administrators, that the University incorporate, into its 1971-73 Legislative Request, a request for sufficient funding to permit the Summer Session tuition schedule to be on a par with the schedule for the regular academic year. At present the Summer Session is very largely self-supporting, which requires higher tuition charges. Such State funding, by underwriting certain overhead costs, would permit parity of tuition schedules.

3. A continuing analysis of the role of the Summer Session in the academic enterprise. This is an extremely complex issue and the Committee is nowhere near even a preliminary set of recommendations.

The chairman would like to note that the contributions of the student members were of a very high order indeed. Attendance was extremely good and the constructive proposals made were many and excellent. (If a light-hearted comment is allowable, the chairman was also amazed at the size of the lunches the younger generation can put away and still remain alert and active.)

JOHN G. TURNBULL
Chairman

XIV. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ALL-UNIVERSITY HONORS

Reported for Information

The All-University Committee on Honors met at least once each quarter to act on Departmental and Collegiate recommendations for the conferral of Outstanding Achievement and Alumni Service Awards, as well as the naming or renaming of University Buildings on all campuses. The Committee on Honors takes its recommendations to the Administrative Committee, following the approval of which they are presented to the Board of Regents.

During this academic year the Committee recommended 13 Outstanding Achievement Awards and 3 Alumni Service Awards, all of which were approved. (Recommendations for awards came from the Law School; the College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics; the School of Nursing; the College of Liberal Arts and the Alumni Association.)

Six buildings have been named or renamed, 2 on the Morris Campus, 1 at Crookston and 3 on the St. Paul Campus.

E. W. ZIEBARTH
Chairman

XV. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND MEDIA

Reported for Information

The following paragraphs constitute the required annual report from the University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media.

Efforts to organize the University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media were somewhat impeded by certain anomalies noted in the composition of the Committee and in the charge to the Committee as given in the "Handbook: A Compilation of Rules and Operational Procedures." A lack of representation from University Libraries and Computer Services seemed to limit the scope of the Committee's concerns in desirable ways, and the overlapping of the charge to the Committee and to that of the Campus Committee on Educational Services seemed to pose a threat of duplication of the efforts of the two committees and inordinate demands being placed on two individuals who were members of both. Discussions to relieve these problems were begun with representatives of the Committee on Committees. A partial solution will be achieved through the normal rotation of membership, but negotiations are still in progress to achieve a more complete solution.

In February the office of the Vice President, Academic Affairs, re-

REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN INVESTIGATION

REPORTED FOR ACTION

The following report of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation is published at this time for your information and consideration. **THE REPORT, WHICH WILL NOT BE PRINTED AGAIN, WILL BE PRESENTED FOR ACTION AT THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE, MAY 28, 1970.** There will be open hearings prior to the meeting of the Senate: Duluth Campus, Monday, May 25, 1970; Morris Campus, the morning of Tuesday, May 26, 1970; Twin Cities Campus on Wednesday, May 27, 1970 at 3:30, the Women's Lounge, Coffman Union.

REPORTED FOR ACTION

PREFACE

Development of policy and procedures relating to the use of human subjects in scientific research and investigation at the University.

In March, 1959, the Dean of the College of Medical Sciences of the University of Minnesota established an Advisory Committee on the Use of Human Volunteers in Medical Research with the responsibilities of "formulation of policies concerning use of human volunteers in medical research; consultation with agencies, e.g. state prison, where such research is carried on." The original advisory committee consisted of five members of the faculty of the College of Medical Sciences, to which an additional "legal member" from the faculty of the Law School was added as an advisor shortly after the original appointment.

In 1961 the function of this committee was expanded at the request of the President of the University so that "when requested to do so by the University of Administration, this Committee will serve to advise concerning the use of human volunteers in research in other units of the University. In such instances the Committee will also include the Director of the University Health Service and/or his designee." This advisory committee did not formulate any formal written policies or procedures, but operated on a case-by-case evaluation of specific research projects presented to it for advice. Implicit in its operation was that if there was substantial objection to the performance of research involving humans that research would not be performed.

In February 1966, the Surgeon General of the United States, as head of the United States Public Health Service, promulgated a Public Health Service grant policy that no research or research training or demonstration grants in support of clinical research and investigation involving human beings would be awarded unless the grantee institution (to which the grants were made) gave assurances that it would provide, as stated in a revision later that year:

"prior review of the judgment of the principal investigator or program director by a committee of his institutional associates. This review should assure an independent determination: (1) of the rights and welfare of the individual or individuals involved, (2) of the appropriateness of the methods used to secure informed consent, and (3) of the risks and potential medical benefits of the investigation."

The responsibility of the grantee institution was further described as follows:

"Safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects involved in research supported by PHS grants is the responsibility of the institution to which the grant is awarded. The institution must assure the Public Health Service that in the case of investigations and activities supported directly by the PHS, it will provide group review and decision, maintain surveillance, and provide advice for investigators on safeguarding the rights and welfare of human subjects. The institution also has the responsibility to provide whatever professional attention or facilities may be required for the safety and well-being of human subjects. The institution shall be responsible for developing the administrative mechanism for review, surveillance and advice; however, the PHS requires that, prior to the inception of each course of investigation, objective decisions be made on the three points cited in the Surgeon General's policy statement (above) by an appropriate committee of associates of the investigator having no vested interest in the specific project involved. . . . Any group responsible for review should possess not only specific scientific competence to comprehend the scientific content of the investigations reviewed, but also other competencies pertinent to the judgments that need to be made."

"The grantee is required to make and keep written records of the group reviews and decisions on the use of human subjects and to obtain and keep documentary evidence of informed consent relating to investigations carried on with the assistance of PHS financial support." —U.S. Public Health Service Policy and Procedure Order #129, Revised July 1, 1966.

The Public Health Service policy was further clarified in December, 1966. "This policy refers to all investigations involving human subjects, including investigations in the behavioral and social sciences."

The President of the University appointed a new All-University Committee on the Use of Human Volunteers to act as a policy-making group, consisting of representatives from medicine and related health sciences, the applied sciences, humanities, social sciences and law, several of whom had been members of the earlier Advisory Committee. This All-University Committee drafted a **Statement of Policy and Procedures at the University of Minnesota With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation**, which was approved and adopted by the Regents in November, 1966, and became the basis for the University's institutional assurance to the Public Health Service. Although the **Statement** was not formally submitted to the University Senate for its consideration, copies of the **Statement of Policy and Procedures** were sent to all of the faculty of the University inviting comments or suggestions for its revision and improvement.

Although the November, 1966, **Statement of Policy** asserted:

"The University of Minnesota agrees with the principles of the United States Public Health Service Policy on Investigations Involving Human Subjects, . . ."

"The University of Minnesota also reaffirms its own established policy

- (a) to fully safeguard the rights and welfare of all human volunteers in medical or other types of research;
- (b) to accomplish this with as little obstruction as necessary to medical or scientific progress through continuing investigation of man in his environment;
- (c) to assume institutional responsibility for the implementation of these two objectives."

the actual assumption of an institutional responsibility was limited to "investigations involving human subjects financed by the U.S. Public Health Service" and the requirements spelled out in the policy that there must be a group review by institutional associates prior to the inception of any investigational procedures involving human subjects and that there was to be continuing surveillance of projects involving human subjects to provide guidance and advice to the investigators were also limited to "investigations involving human subjects financed by the U.S. Public Health Service." In its covering letter to the faculty, the 1966 committee indicated that "because of the seriousness of the issues involved, the committee decided to postpone any effort to establish University-wide policy applying to projects not supported by the Public Health Service until the faculty has had an opportunity to consider the matter and make suggestions. The need for some kind of review seems to be generally recognized. Furthermore, the application of a uniform procedure, unrelated to the source of financial support, appears desirable."

The procedures established in the 1966 Statement continued the All-University Committee on the Use of Human Volunteers as a policy-making body, which was to consist of representatives from the disciplines of medicine, related health professions, biological science, applied natural science, social science, humanities, philosophy and law. The actual administration of policy in providing prior group review of specific projects of investigation and providing the continuing supervision and guidance to protect the rights of the human subjects was to be carried out by a new body, the Clinical Research Committee, consisting of at least eight members from the College of Medical Sciences, one member from the College of Biological Sciences, one member from the College of Education, at least six members from the College of Liberal Arts (one each from anthropology, economics, philosophy, psychology, sociology and the School of Social Work), one from the College of Pharmacy, one from the Institute of Technology, one from the School of Dentistry and at least one from the Law School. In fact, the Clinical Research Committee has grown to approximately thirty-six members which function through subcommittees of nine members representing each of the major disciplines (bio-medical sciences, behavioral sciences, social sciences, humanities and law).

The Present Proposal:

Over the past two years the All-University Committee has been reviewing and revising the original statement of policy and procedures. It has worked closely with the Clinical Research Committee and its Executive Secretary because that committee has had more direct experience with the problems encountered under the present policy. The work of the All-University Committee has been carried on during the present academic year by the newly created University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation, which contains three student representatives, under the new Senate Constitution and By-Laws.

The product of this process of revision is now being presented to the University Senate through the Senate Committee on Research for formal consideration, discussion and approval as University policy. What is being presented is in essence three separate documents:

A Senate Resolution, formally approving the statement of University policy and recommending it for approval and adoption by the Regents; creating a new University Committee under the Senate Constitution to implement the policy; and approving the procedures by which this new committee will operate.

Statement of Policy, which will replace the 1966 Statement of Policy and Procedures as the Regents action, eliminating much of the detailed procedural framework now contained in the 1966 Regents action, but retaining the basic policy determination that research involving human subjects should be a matter of institutional responsibility and should be subject to collegial review and collegial supervision and guidance to protect fully the rights and welfare of the human subject.

Procedures in Furtherance of University Policy, which establishes the administrative structure of the new Human Research Committee, spells out how further detailed policy can be initiated and adopted by that Committee subject to review and modification by the Senate, and then spells out in some detail the procedures for prior collegial review and continuing collegial supervision.

Reasons for the Revision:

One impetus for the revision of the original policy and procedures has been the new Senate Constitution and By-Laws which establishes a Senate Committee on Research "to study and recommend to the Senate policies with respect to research activities and resources of the University" under whose general jurisdiction there is a University Committee dealing with the problems of research involving human subjects. Some revision of our existing structure for administration of policy is needed to bring the current Clinical Research Committee within this Senate committee structure. At the same time, the basic policy considerations should be presented to the Senate for review and reaffirmation or revision.

Secondly, it seems desirable to amend the existing statement of policy and procedures to make it somewhat less detailed and to permit greater flexibility in the continuing development of policy and procedure than is possible with the entire policy and procedure enunciated as Regents action. Any present attempt to modify policy and procedure requires further submission and action by the Regents, presumably after Senate consideration and action. In the two years in which the present Clinical Research Committee has been operating, it has become apparent that we need a less time-consuming method of revising our procedures. What seems appropriate is a fairly broad statement of basic policy laid down by the Senate and the Regents, which includes a definition of what is viewed as "research involving human subjects," with the definition of details of procedure and some detailed policy determinations being made at lower levels more closely connected with the actual administration of the broad policy.

It also seems desirable to combine the policy-generating body and the body administering the policy into a single Human Research Committee, so that those who are initiating policy decisions are persons who administer the policy.

Thirdly, and most importantly, there is the problem of the scope of the University policy and the nature of the institutional responsibility of the University or the faculty and staff of the University in relation to research involving human subjects. It is to this central question or questions that the remainder of this preface is devoted.

A major concern of the members of the All-University Committee in 1966 and the continuing concern of members of the successive committees dealing with the use of human subjects in research has been the question of whether the University should assume an institutional responsibility to provide prior collegial review and continuing collegial supervision of research involving human subjects applicable to all such research, whether financed by the U.S. Public Health Service or by other research grants potential risks to the individual subjects than would colleagues who have worked with the successive committees of the College of Medical Sciences and the University in providing prior collegial review (for any continuing surveillance or supervision has occurred primarily through the periodic review of renewal requests for grants) are persuaded that such collegial review is desirable. They have supported the extension of the University policy to cover all research involving human subjects conducted at the University or under its auspices.

The desirability of collegial review of research involving human subjects by a group of associates drawn from a fairly diverse background of specialties within the University appears to us to be two-fold:

First, because this is research in which humans are involved directly as subjects, it is important that special precautions be taken to assure the protection of the rights and welfare of these individuals. The individual human being has a prime value in our society and the protection of the individual human assumes a prime importance in the pursuit of knowledge. The investigator who is concerned with the advancement of knowledge in one special area and who proposes to undertake research involving humans is likely to be persuaded that the potential benefit of his research

to a larger group of persons is great. He may give less weight to the potential risks to the individual subjects that would colleagues who have a less direct concern with the specific project of research. Moreover, the individual investigator with training in a particular specialty may be less aware of the potential risks to subjects than would be apparent to a group of colleagues drawn from a diverse background of specialized knowledge.

We do not mean to imply that we doubt the integrity of any of our colleagues or their sincere effort to provide protection for any humans who may be subjects of their research. What we do believe is that all investigators are themselves human and therefore are subject to some imperfections of judgment and some limitations of knowledge. We believe that for the more adequate protection of human subjects it is desirable to have a collective rather than an individual judgment as to the risks and potential benefits of research directly involving human subjects.

We do not mean that our position on this issue necessarily involves a conclusion that all individual research must be subjected to collegial review before being undertaken. We recognize that there are many other types of research which have an impact upon human beings, though they do not involve direct participation of humans as subjects. But in other types of research, the impact upon individual humans is likely to be somewhat indirect and to involve further steps or processes than the research itself. While there may be some need for collective judgment before the impact of any research is permitted to seriously affect the rights and welfare of individuals, the collective judgment may be introduced after the research has developed some conclusions. What differentiates the area of the present policy is that there is a direct impact on the individual subjects as a necessary adjunct of the research prior to the development of any conclusions from the research.

Second, we believe that collegial review is desirable for the protection of the individual investigator himself and for the protection of the scientific process. As has been noted, there is a risk that the individual investigator may be overly influenced by his own belief in the benefits of investigation and may underestimate the consequential risk to his subjects. The consequences to him of error in judgment in this regard may be devastating. The consequences to the process of all scientific investigation involving human subjects can likewise be seriously detrimental. The widespread publicity given to incidents such as Dr. Chester Southam's investigation of immunological reaction to implanted cancer cells in aged and infirm patients in the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital in Brooklyn, New York¹ or the experiments of Professor Stanley Milgram, Ph.D., at Yale

1. See Langer, "Human Experimentation: Cancer Studies at Sloan-Kettering Stir Public Debate on Medical Ethics," 143 *Science* 551-553 (February 7, 1964); Langer, "Human Experimentation: New York Verdict Affirms Patient's Rights," 151 *Science* 663-666 (February 11, 1966); Hyman, Letter to Editor, 152 *Science* 862 (May 13, 1966); Lear, "Do We Need New Rules for Experiments on People," *Saturday Review*, February 5, 1966, pp. 61-70; "Research in America: Experiments on People — The Growing Debate," *Saturday Review*, July 2, 1966, pp. 41-50.

University on "Behavioral Study of Obedience"² and the disclosures by Dr. Henry K. Beecher of alleged breaches of ethical conduct in his 1966 article on "Ethics and Clinical Research" in the *New England Journal of Medicine*³ can have a substantial impact upon the entire process of scientific investigation. Had the type of collegial review which we are proposing been applicable to such incidents, we believe that some of the deficiencies of experimental procedures noted by the critics could have been identified and probably avoided by the investigators.

2. Milgram, "Behavioral Study of Obedience," 67 *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 372-378 (1963); Baumrind, "Some Thoughts on Ethics of Research After Reading Milgram's 'Behavioral Study of Obedience,'" 19 *American Psychologist* 421-423 (June 1964); Milgram, "Issues in the Study of Obedience," 19 *American Psychologist* 484 (November 1964).

3. Beecher, "Ethics and Clinical Research," 274 *N.E. J. of Medicine* 1354-1360 (June 16, 1966), which refers to 50 studies containing references to 186 further likely examples of unethical or questionably ethical behavior in experimental procedures involving humans, of which some 22 examples are described in the article. See also Beecher, "Documenting the Abuses" in *Saturday Review*, July 2, 1966, pp. 45-46. To indicate that concern for this problem is not limited to the medical sciences, see the discussions in Ruebenhausen and Brim, "Privacy and Behavioral Research," 65 *Columbia Law Review* 1184-1211 (1965), and 21 *American Psychologist* 423 (1966); Ruebenhausen, "Experiments with Human Subjects," 23 *The Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York*, 92-104 (February, 1968); Wolfensberger, "Ethical Issues in Research with Human Subjects," 155 *Science* 47-51 (January 6, 1967); and "A Preliminary Bibliography on Medical Experiments with Human Subjects," 23 *The Record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York* 375-384 (May, 1968).

The process of preparing a description of proposed research for review by colleagues may alert the investigator to potential risks of which he might not otherwise become conscious. It may also lead to modifications of protocol which are desirable. Those of us who have worked with this program in the past years believe that prior review has involved a desirable educational experience for some investigators.

Concern has been expressed by some members of the faculty that a requirement of prior collegial review of research involving human subjects and a provision for continuing surveillance or continuing supervision of approved projects involve an infringement of academic freedom and of scholarly responsibility.

The members of the present University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation do not believe that there is an absolute and unrestricted claim to freedom from any collegial review of professional conduct and we do not understand others to make a claim to be without any responsibility to their professional colleagues or to the institution of which they are a part in their pursuit of research. The argument on academic freedom seems to focus on the propriety of prior review and a requirement of collegial approval as a prerequisite to the performance of research involving human beings as subjects. The proponents of the academic freedom argument or objection appear to believe that until some clear misconduct is shown a member of the academic profession should be subject to no specific restraints on his professional discretion regarding the research in which he will engage nor the techniques of research which he will use.

What we are proposing, and what has been the practice with regard to research funded by the Public Health Service over the past three years, is not in our opinion a restraint upon the questions of scientific inquiry with which a scholar may choose to concern himself. We do not propose that there be any substantive area of inquiry into which research is not permissible. Indeed, we would agree that to foreclose completely scholarly inquiry into any substantive concern for man in his environment would be a denial of academic freedom.

We do believe, however, that a member of the academic profession does have a responsibility to society and to his professional calling to refrain from techniques of inquiry which directly infringe or imperil the rights and welfare of other human beings. And we believe that the task of preventing such invasion of the rights or peril to the welfare of individuals involved as subjects of research is a matter of collegial concern and not merely individual discretion. Moreover, we believe that where the technique of inquiry involves the direct use of humans as subjects, any questions as to the propriety of technique should be resolved before rather than after any injury to the subjects may occur.

We believe that the development of standards for safety in research involving human beings is a part of the collegial responsibility of academic professionals. As we have already stated, the human limitations of individual judgment and individual knowledge of potential risks of experimentation make collegial determinations desirable to accord the fullest protection to the rights and welfare of the human subjects.

If it were possible to develop detailed statements defining the limits of research involving human subjects, the need for prior review might be lessened. However, we doubt that, in the absence of concrete proposals for specific investigation, the entire spectrum of risks involved in such research will be clear. Moreover, we believe that, even if all the details of prospective or potential human experimentation or research could

be anticipated, the details of the specific regulation necessary to cover all of these possibilities would prove to be so complex as to subject the individual investigator who is expected to comply with them to an unreasonable burden in examining all of the prospective regulations. The application of somewhat general standards by a group of informed colleagues focusing upon the specific proposal for research seems more likely to be efficient. At the same time, through a case-by-case analysis and application of general standards, these general standards of conduct can be made more precise and the nature of the standards of appropriate research technique in dealing with human subjects can be clarified for the academic world.

It has been suggested that the prospect of having to present a projected research item and the risks involved to a group of colleagues and having to await their judgment on the project may deter investigators from undertaking investigations involving human subjects to the ultimate detriment of the advancement of knowledge and man's ability to deal with his environment. The possibility that some investigators may seek other than human subjects for research is a real one. The possibility that needed research will go undone, is not so great, we believe. If, in fact, the prospects of collegial review is a detriment to undertaking a certain project of research, this may indicate the researcher's lack of commitment to the efficacy or need for such research. It may also suggest that the researcher is himself somewhat uncertain of the risk-benefit ratio involved in the use of humans as subjects. As we have said earlier in this preface, we believe that the process of preparing a statement of the potential risks and the means of avoiding them as well as the potential benefits to be derived from the research may prove to be a good prophylactic (in the sense of "fore guard") against the risk of injury to human subjects.

A related concern is that the process of prior review or the continuing supervision will result in unreasonable delays in research or unreasonable burdens of "paper work" on the researcher's time and energy. We are aware of this risk of burden, but hope that the procedures which are outlined in the documents which follow will not impose such unreasonable burdens. We believe we have simplified considerably the present procedures for prior review. In the past two years the Clinical Research Committee has been fairly efficient in providing prompt review and approval of projects. With continuing experience, the improvement of forms for request of approval and a wider understanding of the factors on which the approval depends we believe that the burdens should prove minimal.

The second primary issue with regard to the proposed expansion of the policy of institutional responsibility for research involving human subjects is the definition of what constitutes "research involving human subjects." The term is not defined in the present policy and is not defined in the Public Health Service policy statements except by including all clinical research and investigation and "investigations in the behavioral and social sciences."

The **Statement of Policy** which we are proposing for Regent adoption contains a fairly lengthy "definition" of "research involving human subjects" and related concepts (pages 4 through 8) to which reference is made by footnotes in the earlier portion of that **Statement of Policy** and to which reference is made in the **Procedures**.

The proposed definition is intentionally a broad one. It begins by describing the fullest extent of research involving human subjects (pages 6-8) which would include not only direct participation by humans in the research itself (item (a) on page 6) but also the observation, correlation and evaluation of human activity as reflected in recorded data (item (b) on page 7). This broad concept of research involving human subjects is then distinguished from two other types of activity which involve human participants and which might be designated as "beneficial professional or semiprofessional services" (pages 9-11) or "clinical training" (page 10). The final portion (pages 10-11) of the definition distinguishes between those activities which are essentially beneficial professional or semiprofessional services or clinical training experiences and the separable, and usually subsequent, activity of research based on the data accumulated in the recording of such services and their outcome. Although the initial provision of services is not research and is not subject to the need for prior review or continuing supervision, the use of the data does seem to us to be "research" and appropriately subject to some of the same considerations which relate to performance of experimental procedures directly on humans. This data research does "involve human subjects" since it deals with data which may identify the individual subject, describe his personality or disclose details of his personal life. It seems to us appropriate, therefore, that there be an assurance that the privacy of the individual be protected and that the question of the appropriateness of obtaining consent to the use of such data be resolved. There is also the question of when procedures are undertaken primarily for the benefit of the individual "subject" and when they are undertaken for the research aspects of the study. We have sought to resolve this in the paragraph on pages 10-11.

As indicated, the definition of "research involving human subjects" has been drafted in what is probably its broadest form (with the possible exclusion of beneficial services undertaken with foreknowledge that the resulting data will be the subject of further research). It is apparent that some groups and individuals within the University would prefer a much more restrictive definition. We have chosen to submit this broader statement with the belief that it is easier to qualify and limit the broad definition than to expand a narrower one to take account of the rights and welfare of potential "human subjects." Some possible variations are noted here for purposes of consideration:

1. Elimination of the mere use of data accumulated in the course of professional or semiprofessional services which are beneficial, i.e., omission of item (b) on page 7, with a specific negation of its inclusion.

2. Limitation to the performance of procedures "primarily for the collection of data" and elimination of procedures in which the benefit to the subject or other related humans is of equal significance. One difficulty is that this would appear to eliminate a large portion of what is done in experimental medicine involving considerable risk to the "patient-subject" and might also exclude a substantial amount of experimental procedure in behavioral sciences, in counselling and social work which may involve risks to the "subjects" and all of which we have in the past dealt with as subject to the requirement of prior review if funded by Public Health Service grants. The difficulty here lies in separation of "patient care" or "beneficial service" from experimental research.

3. Limitation of "research involving human subjects" to the performance of those procedures which involve direct contact with or communication with human beings, and eliminating at least the observation and evaluation of data or the products of human activity otherwise carried on and possibly eliminating any observation-only activity where the experimenter or investigator did not himself initiate the stimuli or cause individuals to engage in activity. While this would limit the scope of review to those situations in which there is a deliberate manipulation of the environment of the subject, it would also ignore the possible concern with the privacy of individuals and a concern with whether anyone should be a "subject" of research without his knowing consent.

A definition of the scope of application of the University's policy to research "carried on in the University of Minnesota or under its auspices" is contained in the following section of the policy (page 12). At the same time, there is provision for permitting affiliated hospitals or other institutions to establish their own programs for review and supervision and for research carried on on such affiliated institutions to be subject to "local control." (page 3)

Finally, immediately following the **Statement of Policy** but related thereto, we are presenting two specific limited provisions of policy with respect to two special types of research: observation in a non-manipulated

environment (Specific Policy, pages 1 through 4) and examination and correlation of prior recorded data (Specific Policy pages 5 and 6). These are being submitted to the Senate in the form of specific policy adopted by the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation for approval by the Senate in much the manner in which we are proposing that the future statements of detailed policy may be adopted by the proposed Human Research Committee subject to modification or disapproval by the Senate. We have not included these two policy determinations in the Statement of Policy which the Regents would be asked to adopt in order that the details of these specific policies may be more readily subject to modification in the future. We believe that the formal "prior approval" given to observation in a public place in which there is no manipulation of environmental factors and which does not involve identification of individual subjects is within the scope of the prior review and approval required by the Regents' policy and that the waiver of continuing supervision where no such manipulation of environmental factors and no identification of subjects is involved is also within the spirit of the general Regents' policy as formulated by this committee.

A Summary of the Committee Proposal

Currently any research project involving the use of humans as subjects which is financed by grants from the United States Public Health Service must be reviewed and approved by a group of institutional associates of the investigator prior to the grant of funds and the inception of any investigative procedures involving human subjects, and remains subject to continuing supervision, guidance, and advice by the institutional associates. The prior review and continuing supervision, guidance and advice are limited to (a) assuring that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are adequately safeguarded, (b) ascertaining that appropriate methods are used to secure an adequately informed consent for such research, and (c) ascertaining that the risks to the human subjects are balanced by the prospective scientific benefit of such research.

The proposal presented here expands this policy of prior collegial review and continuing supervision, guidance and advice to cover all research involving human subjects carried on at the University of Minnesota or under its auspices.

The proposal also defines in some detail the scope of "research involving human subjects" [see Statement of Policy] and seeks to define more precisely what factors are relevant to safeguard adequately the rights and welfare of human subjects in some particular types of research involving human subjects.

The administration of the broad policy regarding research involving human subjects is to be carried out by a large and diversified Human Research Committee composed of representatives from bio-medical and related health sciences, non-health sciences (natural, behavioral and social), humanities and law, including students as well as faculty and staff members. This committee is to be established within the structure of the Constitution of the University Senate reporting to the Senate through the Senate Committee on Research.

The Human Research Committee, operating through subcommittees with representative membership, will provide prior review. Application for such review will be made by the principal investigator in writing describing the purpose of his proposed project, the nature of the procedures involving human subjects, the potential risks to the subjects and the precautions to be taken to avoid or minimize these risks, and the methods to be used to secure an adequately informed consent by the subjects or their legal representatives. Review will normally involve a subcommittee meeting at which the investigator is invited to be present if he desires. A decision by the subcommittee to approve or to limit approval to specific modifications in the proposed procedures or to withhold approval is subject to review by the full committee, again with opportunity for the investigator to be present at the committee meeting. Further review is permitted where a claim of infringement of academic freedom is involved.

The Human Research committee will also provide continuing supervision, guidance and advice relating to the rights and welfare of human subjects, with power to suspend or to withdraw approval of research where there is a question of full protection for the rights and welfare of human subjects. This supervision involves requiring reports of proposed modifications in procedure or untoward results or accidents involving human subjects, as well as reports by department heads or attending physicians of questions as to adequate protection of human subjects. The Committee will also require periodic reports of the progress and results of projects approved. On the basis of such reports the Committee, acting through subcommittees, will maintain a continuing supervision with regard to protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects.

The Human Research Committee is to develop more specific policy statements or guidelines for research involving human subjects which will become effective and binding as to all such research conducted at the University or under its auspices after review by the University Senate. This more specific policy may include summary approval of specific procedures of research involving human subjects which are deemed relatively innocuous and widely accepted research procedures.

Distinctions between Present Policy and Procedures (November 1966 Statement) and Proposed Policy and Procedures (1969-70)

Present Policy and Procedures

Coverage of Policy:

1. Applies only to research financed by U.S. Public Health Service;
2. Does not define scope of "research involving human subjects, though U.S. Public Health Service policy does contain some descriptions;
3. Does not describe scope of application of policy "in the University or under its auspices."

Administration and Procedures

1. Procedures include

- a. Prior review and continuing supervision by Clinical Research Committee of 36 faculty and staff acting through 12 to 14-member subcommittees on "medical research," and "social science research," but without explicit power to make or define policy.
- b. Policy making by University Committee on use of Human Volunteers (currently 7 faculty, 2 ex officio from administration, 3 students), some of whom have served on Clinical Research Committee.

2. Involves an elaborate outline of application factors and specific questions for resolution by the reviewing body.
3. Makes decision of Clinical Research Committee final;
4. Requires investigator to make documentary record of consent and to maintain record or forward to Executive Secretary.

Proposed Policy and Procedures

Coverage of Policy:

1. Will cover all research involving human subjects carried on in or under auspices of University of Minnesota;
2. Will define "research involving human subjects" and related concepts;
3. Will define "in the University or under its auspices."

Administration

1. Procedures include

- a. Prior review and continuing supervision by University Human Research Committee of at least 40 faculty, staff and students, acting through 10-member subcommittees with majority from "health sciences" or "non-health sciences and humanities," including student members, contrasting discipline members and law member.
 - b. Policy to be developed by Policy Committee consisting of chairman of UHRC, chairmen of each subcommittee, Executive Secretary, and 4 members at large from UHRC one of whom is a student member subject to approval by full Human Research Committee and review and possible modification by University Senate.
2. Contains a simplified description by application and lists only four general factors to be considered by reviewing body.
 3. Permits limited review of question of infringement of academic freedom by an independent senate or assembly committee with power to require reconsideration by Human Research Committee.
 4. Requires principal investigator to obtain and maintain documentary evidence of informed consent by subject in form required by Human Research Committee.

SENATE RESOLUTION

(This resolution is submitted to the University Senate, through the Senate Committee on Research, for adoption. It is to be the basic Senate action approving the Statement of Policy of the University of Minnesota with Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research, creating the University Human Research Committee, and enacting Procedures in Furtherance of the University Policy.)

Be it resolved by the University Senate of the University of Minnesota:

1. That the University Senate approves and recommends for adoption by the Regents of the University the Statement of Policy of the University of Minnesota With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific

Research (which accompanies this resolution) reaffirming the policy of the University to safeguard fully the rights and welfare of individuals who are involved as human subjects of any research conducted at or under the auspices of the University of Minnesota with as little obstruction as necessary to the furtherance of scientific progress and assuming as institutional responsibilities: to provide prior collegial review and to provide continuing supervision of research involving human subjects and to provide guidance and advice for investigators engaged in such research to assure the continued safeguard of the rights and welfare of the human subjects.

2 That the University Senate in furtherance of this policy and in performance of its institutional responsibility establishes the University Human Research Committee to administer the aforesaid policy and to perform the functions of providing prior collegial review of proposed research involving human subjects and continuing supervision, guidance and advice with respect to projects of research involving human subjects, in accordance with the provisions of the Procedures in Furtherance of University Policy With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research, which accompanies this resolution.

3. That the University Senate approves and adopts Part I of the Procedures in Furtherance of University Policy establishing the Administrative Structure of the Human Research Committee, including its composition, duties and responsibilities, and function as an initiator of further policies and procedures.

4. That the University Senate approves Parts II and III of the Procedures in Furtherance of University Policy With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research, as the initial statements of procedures under the Statement of Policy, subject to amendment and additions under the provisions of the Procedures Part I, subpart C, section 2.

5. That the Statement of Policy of the University With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research, as approved by the Regents, shall be effective as of July 1, 1970 and following its approval by the Regents.

6. That the creation of the University Human Research Committee and the establishment of the Procedures in Furtherance of University Policy With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research shall be effective as of July 1, 1970, and following approval by the Regents of the foregoing Statement of Policy.

7. That as of the effective date of the Statement of Policy and the establishment of the Human Research Committee, the existing University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation, established by the Senate Action on May 22, 1969, and the existing Clinical Research Committee, established by the President in 1967, shall be terminated. Those persons who have been appointed as members of the existing committees and for terms which would otherwise extend beyond the effective termination date shall be eligible for appointment to comparable terms on the University Human Research Committee.

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

(This Statement of Policy is submitted for approval to the University Senate through the Senate Committee on Research and for recommendation to the Regents for adoption to replace the present Statement of Policy and Procedures as adopted in November, 1966.)

The University of Minnesota reaffirms its established policy with regard to the use of human subjects in scientific research:

- A. To safeguard fully the rights and welfare of the individuals who are involved as human subjects in such research*;
- B. To accomplish this with as little obstruction as necessary to the furtherance of scientific progress through continuing investigation of man in his environment, and
- C. To assume an institutional responsibility for the implementation of these two objectives.

In performance of this institutional responsibility, the University of Minnesota will:

1. Provide prior collegial review of all research involving human subjects* carried on in the* University or under its auspices** through a University Human Research Committee composed of institutional associates of the investigator who are independent of the investigator and who have no vested interest in the specific project of research, which collegial review will involve determination of
 - a. the rights and welfare of the individuals involved as human subjects of research,*
 - b. the appropriateness of the methods used to secure an adequately informed consent for research involving human subjects,* and
 - c. the risks and potential scientific benefit of such research;

* "Research involving human subjects" and related concepts are defined later in this Statement of Policy at pages 6 through 11.

** The scope of "carried on in the University or under its auspices" is defined later in this Statement of Policy at page 12.

2. Exercise continuing supervision of such research involving human subjects*, to deal with changes in the procedures or emergent problems of the research which may alter the research with respect to the criteria for collegial review and prior approval;
3. Provide guidance and advice for the investigators on safeguarding the rights and welfare of the human beings involved in such research;
4. Assure that provision is made for professional attention and facilities to provide for the safety and welfare of human beings involved in such research;
5. Make and keep written records of all collegial reviews and decisions on the use of human subjects in such research; and require and keep documentary evidence of informed consent by subjects of all such research involving human subjects.*

* "Research involving human subjects" and related concepts are defined later in this Statement of Policy at pages 6 through 11.

In further performance of its institutional responsibility, the Regents of the University of Minnesota declare that:

No research involving human subjects* shall be carried on in the University of Minnesota or under its auspices** unless, prior to the inception of any procedures involving human subjects,* there has been a collegial review and approval of the research project and its procedures by a University Human Research Committee consisting of representatives drawn from the disciplines of medical and related health sciences and professions, applied natural sciences, social sciences, humanities and philosophy and law; except that where such research is carried on at another institution (such as a hospital or other research facility) which has a similar program of prior group review and advice to the investigator, the group review within that institution shall satisfy the requirements of this policy.

All research involving human subjects* carried on in the University of Minnesota or under its auspices** shall be subject to continuing supervision, guidance and advice by the University Human Research Committee; except that where such research is carried on at another institution (such as a hospital or other research facility) which has a similar program of collegial supervision, guidance and advice shall satisfy the requirement of this policy. It shall be the obligation of that committee to provide such supervision, guidance and advice as is necessary to continue the full protection of the rights and welfare of the human subjects and to accomplish this with as little obstruction as necessary to scientific progress. If at any time there is question as to the full protection afforded to the human subjects of re-

* "Research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" are defined on pages 6 through 11 of this Statement of Policy.

** The scope of "carried on in the University or under its auspices" is defined later in this Statement of Policy at page 12.

search, the Human Research Committee shall have the power to suspend or withdraw its approval of a research project involving the use of human subjects* and following such suspension or withdrawal of approval, the investigator shall not continue to engage in procedures involving human subjects* without further approval of the Committee. The University Human Research Committee, subject to review and modification by the University Senate, may adopt such specific statements of policy and procedures as are necessary to carry out the institutional responsibilities of the University within the limits described in this statement of policy with regard to the use of human subjects in research. Such policies and procedures, once adopted,

* "Research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" are defined on pages 8 through 11 of this Statement of Policy.
 ** The scope of "under the auspices of the University" is defined later in this Statement of Policy at page 12.

shall be binding upon the Human Research Committee and all members of the faculty and staff of the University and all other individuals engaged in research involving human subjects carried on under the auspices of the University.*

The sanctions which may be imposed for any violation of the provisions of this policy with regard to the use of human subjects in research shall include the following:

- (1) withholding of future research funds to be granted by the University or under its administration for further pursuit of research involving human subjects,
- (2) withdrawal of research funds already granted by the University or under its administration for procedures involving human subjects which are in violation of this policy and recovery of funds paid out for such procedures which violate the policy,
- (3) denial of the use of University staff members in the pursuit of research involving human subjects,

* "Research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" are defined on pages 6 through 11 of this Statement of Policy.

- (4) denial of the use of University facilities, equipment or premises for the conduct of research involving human subjects,
- (5) denial of benefits or academic degrees or credit for research involving human subjects which is in violation of this policy,
- (6) requiring that all further research involving human subjects be conducted by a violator only under the direct supervision of another principal investigator.

Definitions: Research involving human subjects and related concepts

The phrases "research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects" and "research projects involving the use of human subjects" as used in this Statement of Policy With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research are intended to cover the full range of activities which involve:

- (a) the collection of data from
 - (1) the examination of individual human beings and their bodily products,
 - (2) the observation of the performance of activities by individual human beings or groups of human beings,
 - (3) the observation of physical or psychological reaction of individual human beings or groups of human beings to stimuli, whether the stimuli are controlled by the investigator or are present in a normal non-manipulated environment,
 - (4) the observation or evaluation of the products of individual performance of tasks or individual reaction to stimuli or other similar research in which human beings other than the investigators or research personnel are directly involved as participants through their active conduct or through passively having procedures performed upon them;
- (b) the examination and correlation or evaluation of data derived from the types of examination or observation described in (a) (1) through (4) above, or research in which data concerning humans other than the investigator is the direct subject of research.

"Research involving human subjects and the correlative phrases "procedures . . ." and "research projects . . ." are not limited to the deliberate experimentation with human beings, although these phrases cover deliberate experimental research upon humans. They include, as well, the performance of any procedures which are not designed and performed primarily for the benefit of the human upon whom the procedure is performed or in relation to whom the procedure is performed but with either a primary or secondary purpose or objective of collecting data for subsequent correlation or evaluation not directly related to the treatment or care of human subjects or the performance of beneficial service to that human subject. Procedures which fall within the scope of "research involving human subjects" include not only physical, chemical, electrical or psychological stimulation of responses within the human body but also interviewing, observation of behavior, administration of tests or other techniques of measurement or evaluation of individual humans.

(Drafters' Note:

The foregoing paragraphs set out the broadest meaning of research involving human subjects and correlative phrases. They include and differentiate between two types of activity which are research: (a) that involving direct participation by the human subject and (b) that in which data concerning humans is the direct subject of the research investigation but which does involve humans as the indirect subjects. Special provisions as to the University's concern with the latter type of research which indirectly involves humans are spelled out in the basic policy statement on page 16.

In the following pages, "research involving human subjects" and correlative phrases are distinguished from three other types of activity which involve human participants other than the investigator but which are not subject to this policy or the procedures implementing it: beneficial services as described on page 9 and clinical training as described on page 10, and collection of data related to beneficial services as described on pages 10 and 11.)

Beneficial services distinguished from research involving human subjects

"Research involving human subjects" or "procedures involving human subjects" as used in this Statement of Policy are distinguished from activities or procedures in which humans are involved solely for the direct benefit of themselves or other individual humans. The latter type of activities and procedures, which might be classified as "beneficial services" include:

- (a) the teaching or training of individuals,
- (b) the examination, investigation or evaluation of individuals for diagnostic purposes for their own benefit or for the immediate benefit of others as in mass screening for disease or physical examination of staff and students associated in the University or other similar institutions or organizations,
- (c) the performance of therapeutic procedures for the direct benefit of the person upon whom they are performed or for the direct benefit of other individuals to whom the human participant has some relation or to whom the human participant has agreed to act as a donor, as in the case of the donation of blood or other tissues or interviewing relative to psychotherapy or counselling services to others,
- (d) the interviewing or investigation of individuals related to the performance of professional services in the practice of counselling, law, psychotherapy, social work or teaching.

Clinical training distinguished from research involving human subjects

"Research involving human subjects" and "procedures involving human subjects," as used in this Statement of Policy, do not include clinical training done within the University or under its auspices, provided that the procedures and activities are performed solely for the purposes of training or for the combined purposes of training and the provision of beneficial services to the individual upon whom the procedures are performed, or in relation to whom the procedures are performed. "Clinical training" covers those procedures and activities used primarily to teach students how to engage in professional or semiprofessional activities with other human beings that the teacher or student involved in the procedure.

Training for conduct of research involving human subjects is within the meaning and scope of this Policy so long as humans are used as subjects for research itself.

Collection of data for beneficial services distinguished from research involving human subjects using such data

In a number of situations within the University or where procedures are performed under the auspices of the University, diagnostic or therapeutic procedures of benefit to the individual upon whom they are performed or conduct in the provision of professional services may be undertaken with the foreknowledge that the record of such procedures or services or the products of such procedures or services will ultimately be the subject of future study and evaluation which would constitute "research involving human subjects" within the meaning given that phrase in this Policy. Where the procedures or performance of services would be undertaken normally be the type of professional involved for the direct benefit of the individual subject to the procedures, rather than for purposes of obtaining information for advancement of human knowledge, the original performance of such procedures or professional services will not constitute "research involving human subjects" or "procedures involving human subjects" as those terms are used in this Statement of Policy.

However, the subsequent use of the records or products of such professional services for purposes other than the direct benefit of the subject or someone related to him or her or for other than clinical training and primarily for the advancement of knowledge shall be considered to be "research involving human subjects" and the present Policy and any procedures designed for its furtherance in the safeguarding of rights and welfare of a human subject shall be applicable to this subsequent use of record data.

Definition: Carried on in the University of Minnesota or under its Auspices.

Research involving human subjects is "carried on in the University of Minnesota or under its auspices" within the scope of this Policy when

1. the procedures are performed on the premises of the University, or
2. the procedures are performed with or involve the use of facilities or equipment belonging to the University, or
3. the research is financed by the University or by funds administered by the University, or
4. the research project satisfies a requirement imposed by the University as a condition for the award of a degree or for completion of a course of study in the University, or
5. the research project satisfies an obligation of employment by the University.

SPECIFIC POLICY STATEMENTS RELATING TO (1) OBSERVATION IN NON-MANIPULATED ENVIRONMENT AS A FORM OF RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS, and (2) USE OF RECORDED DATA INVOLVING HUMANS.

(These are statements of specific policy adopted by the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation and submitted by it to the University Senate for approval within the scope of the more general Statement of Policy already approved by the Regents of the University in 1966 and the revision proposed earlier in this report. It is an example of the type of policy statement which would be developed by the Human Research Committee's Policy Committee and be adopted by the Human Research Committee subject to modification or disapproval by the Senate under the accompanying revised Statement of Policy and the Procedures.)

Policy relating to observation in non-manipulated environment

Where research involving human subjects is limited to (a) the observation of human beings in an environment in which the investigator makes no manipulation of the environmental factors and introduces no new stimuli into the environment, and (b) the evaluation and correlation of data derived from such observation, the concern of the University of Minnesota in relation to its general Statement of Policy With Regard to the Use of Human Subjects in Scientific Research is solely for the protection of the privacy of the individuals who are the subjects of observation. In furtherance of that concern and the general policy of the University, the following specific policy determinations are made:

A. When such observation without manipulation of the environment occurs in a public place in which the public character of the environment should give notice to an individual that his or her behavior may be open to deliberate observation by others present in the same environment, the University's sole concern with protection of privacy is that the identity of the individuals shall not be disclosed through the investigational research without the consent of the individual subjects. Therefore:

1. If the investigator does not anticipate or foresee that he or others in the research project will record in any manner or communicate in any manner the identity of any individual observed, such research is approved within the meaning of the Statement of Policy and further supervision of the research so limited is waived. The investigator need not make a specific application for prior review and approval of his research project and so long as neither he nor others involved in the research project record or communicate the identity of any individual who is observed the project is not subject to any mandatory supervision, guidance or advice from the Clinical Research Committee or any future Human Research Committee, although the investigator may seek such prior review or continuing guidance and advice if he so desires.
 2. If the investigator does anticipate or foresee that there will be any type of recording of individual identity or characteristics which might give rise to identification of individuals observed, or that he or others engaged in the research may make disclosure of the identity of any individual observed in the course of research or publication of the results of such research, he must submit the projected research for prior approval and the project remains subject to continuing supervision, guidance and advice within the scope of the Statement of Policy.
 3. In either event, if the investigator does at some point undertake himself or knows that others involved in the research are going to make a record of identification of individuals subject to observation or does propose to make disclosure of the identity of any individuals observed, he must obtain prior review and approval of such recording or disclosure from the Clinical Research Committee or any future Human Research Committee prior to undertaking such recording, communication or disclosure of identifying facts.
 4. In conducting prior review and in providing continuing supervision and guidance and advice of such project of observation in a non-manipulated environment, the reviewing committee shall limit its review, supervision and advice to the question of whether there has been an appropriately informed consent by the individual subject or subjects to reporting and disclosure of identifying facts.
- B. Where observation occurs in a place other than a public place the public character of which gives an adequate notice that the individual's behavior or presence is likely to be subject to deliberate observation by others and where the circumstances are such that an individual is unlikely to anticipate a premeditated observation of his conduct or presence by others, the primary concern of the University remains the privacy of the individual. In such circumstances, prior review and approval and continuing supervision, guidance and advice by the current Clinical Research Committee or any future Human Research Committee is required. However, the scope of this review and supervision should be limited as follows: The reviewing committee should ascertain:
1. whether the individuals subject to observation will be made aware of the nature of observation, including
 - a. whether he will know he may be subject to a premeditated and deliberate observation of his behavior;
 - b. whether he will be aware of the professional identity of the