

over
call

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1970, 2:15 P.M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCKET

I. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY GOVERNANCE AND STRUCTURE OF THE HEALTH SCIENCES UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy reports for action and will make recommendations concerning the following document at the meeting of the Senate June 4.

The Regents of the University of Minnesota are persuaded that the present trend to a multi-professional or health team approach to the delivery of health care will be extended. This trend has become apparent in the cooperative approach to the education of health professionals. For some time informal coordination of these efforts particularly in the planning for the expansion of the Health Sciences Center has been facilitated by the Council of Health Science Deans and Directors. It appears desirable and necessary to formalize this arrangement and accordingly it is now proposed that a Health Sciences Center be established which will serve as an over-arching organizational unit for the several health sciences.

Mission

The Health Sciences Center of the University of Minnesota should assume leadership in developing programs to meet the needs for health care throughout the state. A continuing mandate is to remain in the closest contact with the people of the state to perceive their health needs in their own terms. There should be a continuing dialogue with the community, in order that the Center may outline possibilities, methods, and practicability of meeting the health needs expressed by the public sector. These programs should be comprehensive and must maintain the high quality of scholarship on which the reputation of this University is based. They must include:

1) Education of the trained professionals required to fulfill the health care needs. The educational facilities and programs must provide the interdisciplinary training and experience essential for the provision of comprehensive health services throughout the state. It is emphasized that there should be a comprehensive approach to the patient, recognizing the potentialities of the health team concept. The programs must be organized so the student acquires the necessary skills, attitudes and principles of knowledge to enable him to give the best possible care.

2) Research to advance the health sciences. This in the broadest sense should include basic biomedical research, investigation of the normal functions of the human body and mechanisms of disease processes, factors contributing to prevention of disease and maintenance of health, studies of methods of organization and delivery of health care in relation to community needs throughout the state, and studies of the process of communication and education through which the effectiveness of the Health Sciences Center may be increased.

3) Providing health care to the people of the state. This function should be closely correlated with educational and research functions since each is supportive of the other. The University Hospitals and Health Science Clinics programs should provide the facilities and resources through which exemplary models of health care programs can be tested and the delivery of comprehensive health care services can be used as a teaching laboratory and demonstration model for all the health professions. To obtain the most effective delivery of comprehensive health care services can be used as a teaching laboratory and demonstration model for all the health professions. To obtain the most effective delivery of health care requires that opportunity be widely available for the maintenance of the competence of the practicing health science professionals. Direct patient care is an essential method for maintaining the educational proficiency of the faculty and for establishment of appropriate educational relationships with community health professionals throughout the state.

In achieving the various segments of the foregoing mission the Regents will undertake to develop the resources commensurate to the commitment of the Health Sciences Center to the people of the State of Minnesota.

Health Sciences Administrative Structure

Throughout its history the University of Minnesota has operated as a single institution with all academic units responsible to the President of the University and through him to the Board of Regents. The close working relationships which this unity has fostered, has strengthened the University and has been a major factor in its development as an institution of great stature among the universities of the world. The close interaction among the many disciplines has been a source of strength and has permitted this University to develop scholastic cohesiveness. Several units of the Health Sciences have strong ties to discipline in other parts of the University, e.g., psychology, engineering, biology, etc. In a team approach to the delivery of health care such disciplines as education, anthropology, sociology, nutrition and economics will need to be involved. These relationships will be most durable and the Health Sciences will thrive best if the Center remains integral to the University rather than standing apart. For these reasons the Regents believe that the organization and governance of the Health Sciences should be sought within a framework which maintains the strength of the Health Sciences as an integral part of the University. As in the case of all major universities, it has become necessary for operational purposes that the President delegate responsibilities to Vice-Presidents in order to develop a proper functional framework for various operational and academic units. The Regents of the University of Minnesota have been charged with unusual responsibility for the development of the University by the people of the State. It is the Regents' responsibility to present the general needs of the University to the Legislature and to determine the distribution of the means provided to meet the objectives of the University. The effective exercise of the responsibility given to the Regents has been a major factor in bringing the University to its present eminence.

The unity of the University should not be given up lightly to achieve short term special advantages for any particular unit of the University. Indeed circumstances which at one point in time appear advantageous in this respect can, at another, be disadvantageous. Some arguments have been presented that status for the Health Sciences essentially independent of the University as a whole will provide optimal circumstances under which the Health Sciences can fulfill their mission. The Regents believe, however, that both in the short and long term the Health Sciences will thrive best and most effectively accomplish their mission as units within the University.

For these reasons the Regents propose that the Health Sciences be

headed for administrative purposes by a Vice President for Health Sciences Affairs. This Vice President shall have the responsibility for developing goals and operational plans in conformity with the missions of the Health Sciences and for developing inter-Unit collaboration in fulfilling the missions of the Health Sciences. He will be the principal line officer for the Health Sciences to whom all Deans and Directors in these fields will be responsible. He will represent the Health Sciences and be the advisor to the President, Board of Regents and within the councils of the Central University administration in matters pertaining to the missions and operations of all health sciences programs of the University wherever they are situated in the State. The Vice President for Health Sciences Affairs will report to the President who will, where appropriate, delegate operational aspects of the programs to other officers of the Central Administration.

The Vice President for Health Sciences Affairs in cooperation with the Deans and Directors of the Health Sciences Units shall have the responsibility for developing a coordinated resource request for all Health Sciences. The Regents and President, acting through University policies and procedures, will allocate resources of funds and space to this Vice President in response to his request. The Vice President, after consultation with appropriate University officers and with such advisory bodies to the Vice President as may be established, shall have the responsibility for allocation of these resources to the individual Health Science units. The Vice President for Health Sciences Affairs will delegate to the Deans and Directors in this area the responsibility for deployment of resources assigned to the respective Units to meet the objectives of the Units consistent with University standards and policies.

The proposed organization of the Health Sciences Center will require dissolution of the now existing College of Medical Sciences. The present Schools of Public Health, Nursing, the Medical School and the University Hospitals will become constituent units of the Center headed by Deans with the exception of the University Hospitals whose administrative officer will bear the title of Director. The College of Pharmacy and the Dental School will be joined in the Health Sciences Center as units with those named above. It would be appropriate to designate these units in uniform style either as schools or colleges. The principal administrative officers of each of these units will be directly responsible to the Vice President.

The Regents recognize the multi-lateral relationships in which the College of Veterinary Medicine is involved. The affairs and activities of the College of Veterinary Medicine will be important to the Health Sciences and vice versa. It is proposed that the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine carry adjunct status in the Health Sciences Center to facilitate coordination and cooperation but that the status of the College otherwise remain as it is at present.

The location of the Departments of Mortuary Science and the History of Medicine, presently reporting directly to the Dean of the College of Medical Sciences, will need to be determined by the Vice President for Health Sciences Affairs.

It is assumed that the Vice-President for the Health Sciences will establish a number of advisory groups for purposes of planning and coordination of the various areas of activity within the Health Sciences. Specifically, for administrative purposes, it is assumed that there will be created a Council of Deans and Directors who will serve the Vice-President in a cabinet capacity. It is also assumed that the office of the Vice-President will require the appointment of a number of assistant and associate officers responsible for major Center-wide functions.

The External Visiting Committee in its report made the following statement about the responsibility of the Center:

"The Center has a continuing mandate to remain in the closest contact with the people of the state to perceive their health needs in their own terms — not necessarily as perceived by the professional. Indeed, the Center can make a major contribution by engaging in a continuing dialogue with community, Regents and legislators. A new pattern of professional-public interchange can be generated. The professional becomes the expert witness who outlines possibilities, methods, and practicability of meeting the health needs expressed by the public sector. The professional provides the data so that rational public policies can be adopted from among recognized alternatives. The choice of goals — the distribution of resources between health and other social purposes — remains with the Regents and the public. This having been done, University administrators, faculty, and students will be able to interpret and implement the mission of the Health Sciences and will be able to work together toward a common goal."

The Regents, therefore, recommend the establishment of a committee advisory to the Vice-President broadly representative of the professions related to the health sciences and including representation for the public. They propose that this committee be appointed by the President of the University from nominations submitted by the Vice-President with the advice and counsel of the Health Sciences Deans and Directors. It would be appropriate for the Advisory Committee to concern itself in the role described by the External Visiting Committee.

Basic Health Sciences

The Regents are mindful of the concerns expressed by the health science units outside the Medical School that their needs have not been fully met by the Basic Health Sciences, presently constituted of the departments of (Anatomy, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pathology, Pharmacology and Physiology). They are also aware of the long and important relationship between the basic sciences and the Medical School which has strongly influenced the developments in clinical medicine. It is not the wish of the Regents to disturb this close relationship but to seek arrangements which will provide for closer liaison with the other Health Science units which will insure that their needs are more fully realized and met.

The Regents propose that the Basic Health Sciences remain integral to the Medical School. A coordinator for the basic sciences with an academic appointment appropriate to his discipline should be designated to serve as a staff officer to the Vice-President to define over-all basic science

needs for all units of the Health Sciences. The coordinator shall have the specific responsibility for seeing to it that the basic science programs effectively serve the programs of all health science units. He and appropriate members of the Basic Science Faculty might properly hold faculty status in units other than the Medical School.

The Regents are particularly concerned that the needs of the Health Science units outside the Medical School be well served and accordingly propose that a review of the effectiveness of the arrangements proposed be carried out after a suitable trial period.

Allied Health Professions

There is need to encourage development of new programs in the allied health sciences in order to meet the requirements for the delivery of health care throughout Minnesota. Each Health Science Unit which now trains allied health personnel will continue presently established programs in their existing locations. As programs for new types of allied health personnel are developed, each curriculum should be organized within the collegiate unit and department which relates most closely to the role which such allied health personnel will serve in delivery of health care.

In each of the Units in the Health Sciences which trains allied health personnel an Administrative Officer, drawn from the faculty, shall be assigned the responsibility for coordinating allied health training programs, providing a central source of leadership, promoting the development of new training programs as needed and acting as staff advisor to the Dean on policy related to allied health personnel within the Unit. This Administrative Officer shall act as Chairman of a Council of Allied Health Sciences Professions which shall be composed of a representative from each of the allied health training programs located in that Unit (Dentistry, Medicine, etc.). This Council is assigned the responsibility for development of appropriate coordination between programs within the respective Units and among the several Health Sciences Units.

A coordinator of all these programs shall be located in the office of the Vice President of Health Sciences Affairs.

The Regents recognize that the patterns of health care delivery may well change markedly in the future requiring the development of new professionals who do not fit the present structure of the health science disciplines. These new professionals may well bridge the existing disciplines and may, in fact, involve disciplines outside those in the proposed Health Science Center. The Regents propose, therefore, that the structure proposed above be subject to review and possible modification after a suitable interval.

Public Health

The School of Public Health has had a long standing tradition of concern for the prevention of disease and the maintenance of conditions desirable for the promotion of community health. Given the stipulated mission for the Center of Health Sciences the Regents believe that the Public Health unit can play an important role in developing broad innovative patterns for health care delivery involving professionals from within and without the Center for the Health Sciences. This unit can provide educational programs which will develop public understanding of the resources available to meet community needs and facilitate communication of public expectations to the Health Sciences.

University Hospitals

The University Hospitals play a key role in offering service to the people of Minnesota while serving as the principal clinical laboratory for the Health Services Center. The Regents believe that the University Hospitals can serve all the health science units most effectively as a distinct unit in the Health Sciences Center. The Director of the Hospitals should be a member of the Health Sciences Council with status equivalent to that of the Deans of the other health science units. The Regents recognize that policy for and administration of such a complex as the University Hospitals involves participation by many groups having interests varying both in degree and emphasis. Such special groups will wish to be able to influence the administration and operations of University Hospitals. In particular the relationships of the clinical departments of the Medical School and their counterparts in the other health science units (e.g., Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry, ambulatory care programs, Public Health) will have special concerns. It is recommended, therefore, that the heads of the clinical departments of the Medical School and their counterparts in other health science units should be appointed chiefs of the clinical services and related services of the Hospital. This group could form a Clinical Council advisory to the Director of the University Hospitals. Representation on the Council might also include representatives from the staff at large and an ex-officio representative of the Vice President for the Health Sciences. Such a Clinical Council would be large and it would be appropriate, therefore, for the Council to elect from its members an appropriately representative executive committee including an ex-officio representative of the Vice President. The Council and its Executive Committee should be chaired by the elected chief of staff of the University Hospitals. The Clinical Council should have as its concern the quality and adequacy of the professional programs within the University Hospitals. The Deans and Directors of all the health science units will have a major concern for the activities of the University Hospitals as they relate to the instructional and research activities of their collegiate units. It would be appropriate for the Council of Deans to have the opportunity to review the University Hospital budget during its preparation to insure that the needs for the units for which they have concern receive adequate consideration.

Affiliation—Hospitals, Community Agencies and Services

The Medical School has developed undergraduate and graduate teaching programs in affiliated hospitals over a period of many years. These programs are a major source of strength in medical education and will become increasingly important in education in the other health sciences. A large number of full-time as well as part-time faculty are located in these hospitals. Initially the program involved Hennepin County General Hospital, St. Paul Ramsey County Hospital and Veterans Administration Hospital. More recently a number of private hospitals have been included in the teaching program. The educational programs may involve multiple departments or may relate to a single department. Formal affiliation agreements have been developed to guide the relationship between the hospital and medical school.

Other Health Science units have begun to develop relationships with the affiliated hospitals but as yet these programs do not involve large numbers of students. In the future these relationships may be expected to expand.

The actual training of Health Science professionals is carried out by the individual departments at the University and coordinated by the Deans of the Colleges who are directly responsible for the curriculum content and its implementation. With the expansion of the number of professionals to be trained and the need to incorporate the affiliated hospitals into such a training effort, it is important that some uniformity of departmental effort and goals be maintained in order to develop properly those teaching efforts necessary to accomplish this goal. The involvement of individual departments in other relevant academic units in coordinated educational efforts will be essential if uniformity of quality is to be maintained.

A coordinator in the office of the Vice President should be appointed and serve to coordinate programs involving more than one health science unit and to develop new programs. He would also be responsible for development of relations with non-hospital health delivery systems and with community groups. The Regents foresee that such affiliate relationships may provide opportunities for health science education programs which may vary in kind and emphasis.

As the complexity and size of the Health Sciences develop it may become desirable to establish separate clinical campuses. This would require an administrative structure in the office of the Vice President which would facilitate programmatic relationships. Such developments would be preceded by adequate consultation with the faculties and administrators of the various units within the Health Sciences Center.

Graduate School Relationships

The External Committee recommended that the present requirements with respect to the graduate status of "Residents" should be modified. The Regents support the recommendation that "Residents" should not automatically be required to register as graduate students but rather that the option should be determined according to individual choice and subject to departmental or collegiate policy. Alternate methods for registration of Residents as students in the appropriate Health Sciences school should be developed. The Regents believe that the basic direction and control of the clinical program of residents associated with programs in the individual Health Sciences units should be a shared responsibility of the Health Sciences Center, the particular unit and the appropriate department.

These conditions apparently have been a problem primarily for the Medical School but it is the Regents' intent that these modifications should be applicable in other health science units where appropriate.

Residency and graduate programs in the health sciences will impose major demands on the resources of the University and the Health Sciences Center. It seems appropriate therefore that the Vice President for the Health Sciences should have some administrative responsibility in cooperation with the Deans of the Health Sciences Units for determining the relative effort devoted to such programs.

However, the admission of candidates to residency programs and the number of such residents should continue to be the responsibility of the departments and specialties according to their individual programmatic needs relative to their education and research objectives. The Vice President of the Health Sciences will have the responsibility for reviewing the recommendations of the departments with the objective of insuring balance and will be responsible for the distribution of available state resources according to over-all program needs and balance. The Vice President, the Deans and Departmental Heads of the Health Sciences should share with the Dean of the Graduate School the responsibility for the quality of graduate programs and the standards of admissions.

Continuing Education

The Regents recognize the responsibility of the University for assisting practicing health care professionals to maintain their capability through continuing education. The trend toward periodic recertification of health care professionals gives this University activity special importance. The Vice President for the Health Sciences and his staff will be expected to assist and coordinate the activities of each of the health science units. The direct responsibility for the continuing educational programs will rest with the individual health sciences units. The Vice President's office will provide appropriate liaison with the General Extension Division.

ROBERT S. HOYT
Chairman

II. SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES, 1970-71

Reported for Action

Student members to be named at next Senate meeting.

Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations: Jeanne Lupton (chairman), Austin Anderson, Paul Berrisford, Eugene Eidenberg (ex officio), John Imholte, Leslie King, James Preus, Ruth Richards, Peter Roll, Stanley Sahlstrom, Robert Sonkowsky, Stanley Wenberg (ex officio).

University Committee on University Honors: William Lockhart (chairman), Edwin Haislet (ex officio), William McDonald, William McEwen, Harold Peterson, Duane Scribner (ex officio), William Shepherd (ex officio), John Turner, Theodore Uehling, Al Heimback, Alumni Association.

University Committee on Printing and Publications: Donald Woods (chairman), Sherwood Berg, Frank Braun, John Fisher (ex officio), Ralph Hopp, Richard Mather, Jane McCarthy (ex officio), Lester Metz (ex officio), Malcolm Myers, Duane Scribner (ex officio), Harold Swanson (ex officio).

University Schedule Committee: Landis Boyd (chairman), John Fisher (ex officio), Raymond Lammers, Lloyd Loftquist (ex officio), Valworth Plumb, Robert Plunkett, Glenn Reed, John Webb.

University Committee on Social Policy: Burnham Terrell (chairman), Elving Anderson, Ernest Coleman, George Donohue, Eugene Eidenberg (ex officio), Warren Ibele, Stanley Kegler (ex officio), James Reeves, David Ward.

University Committee on Business and Rules: Roger Page (chairman), Donald Beatty (ex officio), Ronald Brown, John Cound, Eleanor Fenton, Leverett Hoag, Jay Roshal, Frank Sorauf.

Senate Committee on Educational Policy: Robert Hoyt (chairman), May Brodbeck, Sylvan Burgstahler, Paul Cashman (ex officio), Orval Driggs, Russell Hamilton, Stanley Kegler (ex officio), Norman Kerr, Al Linck, Toni McNaron, Wallace Russell, William Shepherd (ex officio), James Wertz.

Council on Liberal Education: Lloyd H. Lofquist (chairman), William E. Gardner, John Imholte, Daniel Joseph, Norman Kerr, Siegfried Grosser, Jay Hughes, Leon Reisman, C. William Rudelius, Wolfgang Taraba, John Verrill, John W. Webb, James Wertz.

University Committee on Extension and Community Programs: Richard Swalin (chairman), Roland Abraham (ex officio), Bruce Balow, Francis Boddy, Anna Carpenter, David Darby, Eugene Eidenberg (ex officio), David Giese, John Mauriel, Richard Skok, Willard Thompson (ex officio), David Ward, George Williams.

University Committee on Computing Facilities: Hugo John (chairman), Eugene Ackerman, Gordon Davis, John Gergen, Audrey Grosch, Richard Halvorson, James Jenkins, William Shepherd (ex officio), Donald Smith (ex officio), Frank Verbrugge (ex officio).

University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media: Eugene Wright (chairman), Russell Burris, Bright Dornblaser, Raymond Fusaro, Gordon Kingston (ex officio), Ken MacCorquodale, Harlod Opgrand, Burton Paulu (ex officio), Willard Philipson (ex officio), Cletus Schertz, James Wertz (ex officio).

University Committee on Summer Sessions: John Turnbull (chairman), Paul Cartwright, Thomas Chamberlin, Eugene Eidenberg (ex officio), Roxanna Ford, Arnold Henjum, Magnus Olson, Douglas Pratt, Willard Thompson (ex officio).

Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs: Scott Maynes (chairman), Thomas Boman, Hale Champion (ex officio), Isabel Harris, Eric Klinger, Robert Morris, Stephen Scallen, William Shepherd (ex officio).

University Committee on Tenure: Carl Auerbach (chairman), Marion Brooks, Henry Ehlers, Roger Larson, Howard Morris, Paul Murphy, William Shepherd (ex officio), C. Arthur Williams.

Senate Judicial Committee: Charles H. McLaughlin (chairman), Ruth-erford Aris, David Berninghausen, Donald Gillmore, Allan McCoid.

Senate Library Committee: Gerhard Weiss (chairman), Kent Bales, David Berninghausen, Russell Dubois, Fred Forro, Howard Hanson, Peter Roll, Edward Stanford (ex officio), William Wright.

Senate Committee on Research: William Flanigan (chairman), Hale Champion (ex officio), Bryce Crawford (ex officio), John Gander, Willard Hartup, Robert Holloway, William Hueg (ex officio), Stanley Kegler (ex officio), James Lawver (ex officio), Robert Mulhausen, Alfred Nier, L. E. Scriben, William Shepherd (ex officio), Robert Wirt.

University Committee on Use of Human Subjects in Investigation: Paul Meehl (chairman), Francis Boddy (ex officio), Russell Lucas, Homer Mason, Jack Merwin, Roberta Simmons, Lawrence Weaver, Anne Wirt (ex officio), Carl Witkop.

Senate Committee on Resources and Planning: Warren Ibele (chairman), John Borchert, Hale Champion (ex officio), Robert Heller, Stephen Granger, Hosni Iskander, Robert Mulhausen, Vernon Ruttan, William Shepherd (ex officio), Donald Smith (ex officio), Stanley Wenberg (ex officio), James Wertz, Roger Wilk.

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1970, 2:15 P.M.

MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

SUPPLEMENTARY DOCKET

I. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

1. Reported for Information

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON UNIVERSITY-ROTC RELATIONSHIPS

This report was published in the Minnesota Daily, May 18, 1970.

2. Reported for Action

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE GENERAL COLLEGE 1970-1980

The future of the General College should be viewed as part of a commitment—a commitment by the people of Minnesota to education beyond high school for the many. When the states Higher Education Coordinating Commission proposes that, by 1985, 85% of high school graduates should have the opportunity to continue their education, primarily in public institutions, the Commission reflects this commitment. Dramatic increases in legislative support for the state junior colleges reflect it again. Thus, a key question facing the state, and its systems of higher education, is how to make higher education accessible in Minnesota to those who, in increasing numbers, will seek it. For although estimates of the magnitude and rate of growth vary, no one is predicting that fewer students will seek education after high school in 1980 than were in 1970.

Conservative projections suggest the increase in numbers can be accommodated by expanding existing institutions. Other projections, however, predict the need for new institutions. Nevertheless, those studying the problem agree that capacity to accommodate sheer numbers will not of itself provide greater access to educational opportunity. (In the Twin Cities area particularly, the relationship between availability of space and availability of opportunity will soon become a critical problem.) A recurring theme in studies of higher education—in Minnesota as elsewhere—is the need for experimentation with new models. Education's house does not lack advocates of change—each crying his own particular version.

Some of the more recent proposals for change have been: to bring all two-year post-secondary programs in Minnesota under the governance of a single board; to establish a free-standing upper division college in the Twin Cities; to locate a new comprehensive four or five year state college in the same area; to convert a metropolitan junior college into a baccalaureate institution; to expand the upper division capacity of the University, particularly on the St. Paul campus; to expand the mission of University College; and to modify the General College so that included in its programs are some at the baccalaureate level.

This paper is a response to the proposal mentioned last. In February of 1970, the Vice Presidents requested the General College to "enter into discussions with representatives of Central Administration and appropriate Senate committees concerning the feasibility and possible form of the proposed expansion of G.C. mission and function."

Since the decision to modify the College is a major one, not only for the College, but for the University, and thus for the State, it is important to make clear the position taken by the General College with regard to its future role and function. This position can be stated in relation to two basic issues: (1) The need for change, and (2) Modification of General College as a desirable response to the need.

I

The Need for Change

One factor underlying the persistent demand for experimentation and change in higher education is the growing awareness that traditional baccalaureate institutions no longer fit the needs and aspirations of large numbers of students. This is made clear by one study after another of student unrest, alienation, and dissatisfaction, not to mention the direct demands for reform by students themselves. In the University the recent proposals for modifying University College and establishing a new experimental college stem in large part from student and faculty dissatisfaction with traditional undergraduate programs.

Another underlying factor, not so widely discussed perhaps, but of even greater long range significance, has been the emergence of a stratified system of higher education.

No doubt it was an awareness of this problem that prompted President Moos to declare in a recent speech that establishing "parity of relationships" must receive high priority as Minnesota's systems of post-secondary education develop in the 1970's. Dr. Moos said:

There cannot be, during the seventies, any continuation of a big-brother syndrome. As systems and institutions mature, they must be accepted into full partnership in educational endeavors. We must not create a layer cake of institutions exclusively concerned with different segments of our population. Rather we must seek a marble cake relationship—sharing missions and students of differing abilities and permitting them to move in a mobile market of educational opportunity. (underlining added.)

If stratification of higher education were simply an efficient division of labor which avoided expensive overlap and duplication, it might well be justified educationally. But a stratified system of education is not merely an academic matter. Linked with stratification of functions is stratification of status: the layer cake mentioned by President Moos. In the United States, 1970, it is axiomatic in the public mind that access to post-high school education is the key to economic and social status, as well as to economic and social mobility. Any system of stratification, therefore, which at some point denies educational opportunity will be interpreted as a denial of economic and social opportunity, even if in fact such is not the case.

Furthermore, the stratified system has recently revealed its weakest links—the links that should connect the institutions making up the various layers. Noting that the educational patterns of junior colleges are by design not those of existing state colleges or the University, Dr. Mitau, chancellor of the state college system, asserted before the HECC that "too often senior institutions are insensitive to the purposes of the junior college and unwilling to make the necessary efforts to accept a maximum number of credits that properly fit into a baccalaureate level education." "In order to facilitate this transferability of credits," Mitau continued, "there needs to be a respect by the senior institution for the wide diversity of purposes and students in the junior college upon which can be based a meaningful, forward looking articulation policy."

The diversity just mentioned, particularly with regard to student characteristics, must be taken into account when assessing the need for change. The near future will find over 50% of college freshmen and sophomores enrolled in junior colleges. These are the many to whom a commitment has been made.

In the metropolitan area, if the University follows the HECC proportions of 1/3 lower division, 1/3 upper division, and 1/3 graduate and professional enrollments, by 1980 the University will decrease its total lower division enrollment compared to 1970 by 800. On the other hand, by 1980, junior colleges, or some other lower division facility, will need to accommodate 27,800 students more than in 1970. Obviously, most of the lower division enrollment in the metro area will be outside the University. But unless this group of students turns out to be different both from the typical junior college student, and the typical General College student, about 90% of them will have as their major educational goal transfer to a baccalaureate program.

There is evidence that the typical graduate of a junior college or two-year program such as the General College is in some respects different from his counterpart who began as a freshman in a four-year institution. He differs, however, not so much in his abilities as in his stated goals and interests. The American College Testing Service study of the junior college student (December, 1969) reports:

Two-year college students were found to be less able academically than their peers at four-year colleges. While test scores and high school grades both suggest this, they also show considerable overlap of the students at the two types of colleges. Many two-year college students have higher aptitude than the average four-year college student; conversely, many four-year college students have lower aptitude than the average two-year college student.

The difference between the two-year college student and his peer in the four-year lower division with regard to goals and aspirations was emphasized by Dr. Robert Altman, an expert on the upper-division college, who told the HECC that the "junior college transfer student has special needs and desires which must be met by upper division schools." If given a choice, a junior college graduate will choose a professionally-oriented, rather than a pure science school; he is "now" oriented, rather than "defer" oriented; and he is concerned with a baccalaureate degree that will lead directly to employment rather than to graduate school. The most recent studies of General College students (January, 1970) suggest that they closely resemble the two-year college students studied by ACT and by Altman.

In the minds of many who accept the layer cake approach, access to a terminal non-baccalaureate program should be sufficient opportunity for the majority of high school graduates. This is not self-evident to a majority of two-year college students. Indeed, there is little evidence the typical two-year college student plans to conclude his education with a terminal associate in arts degree. Quite the contrary. Only 10% of the entering students in the ACT group reported as the highest level of education they planned to complete a junior college degree. The January, 1970 study of GC students confirms this finding. Less than 20% of the first-year students queried indicated a preference for completing their education at the second, or even at the third year of college. The powerful social and family pressures that produce this level of aspiration among two-year students has been referred to in the previous discussion of stratification of status and opportunity.

It is often said, in response to the plans and aspirations of these thousands of average students, that their plans and aspirations are unrealistic. The standard response is contained in the ACT study: "Perhaps two-year colleges could encourage students who are unlikely to be able to transfer to think more realistically about their futures." But it is important to emphasize that attempts at re-orientation have thus far been unsuccessful. As the ACT researchers admit, "it is clear that very few students have been 'cooled out'—lowered their aspirations—during their two-year college career."

The point just mentioned leads to an interesting question: should it be a primary mission of the public two-year colleges to "cool out" the majority of their students? A somewhat unflattering way to phrase the layer cake answer would be to say, "If they must have cake, let them eat cake, but let it be the bottom layer." (It is interesting to speculate on what happens to the top layer if the bottom layer disappears.)

Against this background, it is not self-evident that the residents of the metropolitan area will find convincing the reasons given for controlling the lower-division enrollment of the University. Nor is it obvious that any attempt to escalate admissions standards at either the lower or upper division level will stand the test of public pressure. Be that as it may, it seems clear that shifts in the pattern of enrollment in the University must be made with a clear understanding of the students who are really out there—their abilities, their needs, their aspirations, and their potential. Otherwise the spaces provided may be filled with the wrong people, assuming with the Kegler Task Force Report that the University could accommodate the metro upper division demand through 1980. Unless the University is prepared to divorce itself from the two-year college student, it must at the very least experiment with new ways to provide appropriate patterns of extended education for them. Put bluntly, the University can ill afford to proclaim as a priority for the state a "marble cake relationship—sharing missions and students of differing abilities and permitting them to move in a mobile market of educational opportunity, if the institution itself does not undertake to find ways to make such a relationship a reality.

Nor can the University encourage others to become student centered as well as discipline centered unless, as the major academic institution in the state, it is willing to experiment with models that have as a basic purpose "maximizing human potential."

From the statements by President Moos, by the Vice Presidents in the St. Paul Prospectus, and in the Kegler Task Force Reports, the General College concludes that administration of the University is encouraging experimentation with new models. The administrative officers of the University seem convinced that no matter how the enrollment problem is solved with respect to numbers, simply doing more of the same will not solve the problem of access to greater opportunity. Admitting students to programs they do not fit is not the way to expand educational opportunity. The rationale for change in institutions, as in programs, must be that, better than existing ways, the new patterns will solve the problem of appropriate programs for the two-year college graduate who wishes to pursue a bachelor's degree.

No matter what plan, or plans, of action are adopted to provide access to higher education, the foregoing analysis of the need suggests that a critical part of the total response by Minnesota higher education must be to devise new programs that provide a quality education which is unique to the average high school graduate, suitable for students who have non-professional, or non-specialist goals, and is adapted to those who, thus far, have made less than spectacular academic records, but who in often surprising numbers, and in intriguing ways, rise above the estimates of their potential if given the right opportunity.

II

Modification of the General College as a desirable way to meet the need

It is possible that the simplest, most direct, potentially most advantageous way for the University to attack the problems outlined in the first section of this paper would be for the General College to emphasize during the next decade, in addition to its terminal associate in arts programs, the development of experimental third and fourth year programs, some of which would terminate with a General College bachelor's degree.

By philosophy and by experience, the College is well-equipped to respond to the needs of the typical two-year college student. Perhaps more than any college in the state, the General College has developed an empirical base for devising programs that, for 38 years, have been specifically addressed to this group—its present student population. Without establishing a new institution, the state can, through the General College of the University, organize the elements of post-secondary education in new and unique ways—ways that might later be found useful as new institutions are developed.

The College already contains these elements, or has access to them. This makes the present GC program unique as these elements are now employed. But none of these, or the manner in which they might be combined need be limited to two-year programs: open admission need not; a free-choice curriculum need not; nor monitoring each student's individually planned program of study with a system of advising and counseling. A comprehensive testing program to identify student characteristics and verify academic achievement both of breadth and depth need not be limited to two-year programs. The variety of existing combinations of general and occupational education, the combinations of classroom experience, supervised field-work, internships, and independent study are all applicable in programs that go beyond two years.

The range of supportive services provided for students who, for one reason or another, enter the University at a disadvantage does not in principle end at the second year; nor do the internship programs for prospective college teachers and counselors. The research center which coordinates, and assists with research and evaluation in the College need not limit its activities to two-year programs. And finally, it is not principle, but practice which places boundaries on the existing combinations of General College resources with those of other University units, and other institutions.

Consequently, the General College welcomes the opportunity to modify practice and begin experimenting with new programs. Doing so will extend the educational opportunities of its students, and its faculty. The guidelines the College proposes to employ in developing new programs are as follows:

A. Basic Policy

1. General education will continue to be the core of the total program.
2. The College will continue its two-year Associate Arts program.
3. On-going evaluation of the programs and mission of the College will be an integral part of that mission.
4. Students, faculty, and administration will share in the formation of policy.
5. Expansion of the mission of the General College should be contingent upon necessary funding.

B. New Forms: A Commitment to Experimentation

1. Planning of future programs may include, but should not be circumscribed by, such categories as credits, hours, grades, divisions, levels, or course.
2. The approach to new programs should be pragmatic and pluralistic. Not one model, but a variety of models will be used in developing quite various certificate and baccalaureate programs.
3. Better, more expedient, means of initiating change should be developed so that programs and activities do not become embalmed.
4. Stronger programs of orientation, counseling, and advising should be developed, and students should participate in their development and operation.
5. All programs in the College should be articulated so as to provide maximum educational and occupational mobility for students.
6. The College should not simply extend its present program but should launch out on genuinely new bachelor's degree and certificate programs which do not duplicate those now available in the University.

C. The Students

1. Freshman admission policy should remain one of open admission with reliance on our stratified sample system if applications become too numerous. Students should represent a wide range of abilities, interests, talents, and social, ethnic, and economic backgrounds—a rough cross-section of American society.
2. Admission to any program beyond the A.A. degree should draw from all students groups for whom the programs of the College are appropriate with reliance on our stratified sample system if applications become too numerous.
3. Enrollment in the College should not by 1980 exceed 4,000 which approximates the enrollment in recent years and is compatible with its mission.
4. Students should participate more fully in the development of policy and curriculum, making as many of the decisions about their own education as possible.

D. The Curriculum

1. Both the free-choice curriculum of the College and combination programs should be continued.
2. The curriculum of the College should be the joint responsibility of students, faculty, administration, and such outside groups as may be appropriate as, for example, in the development of occupational or community programs.
3. The development of a living-learning center with housing, academic, and leisure facilities should be promoted.

4. A capacity for evaluation and change should be essential to new courses and programs.
5. The ideal for evaluating performance—for students and staff—should be criteria clearly based on the goals and purposes of the College and related to its unique function.
6. New methods of evaluation should be sought, and each student or group of students should be allowed to choose from a broad spectrum of methods of evaluation.
7. Special and occupational programs should be integrated with general education.

Traditionally, the mission of the University has been defined in terms of teaching, research, and public service. As a part of the University, the General College should make a unique contribution to the role and purposes of the University. Changes in the College, therefore, should be viewed in light of their possible advantages for the University as a whole. The following seem to be advantages for the total University of modifying the mission of the General College. Modification could:

1. Provide a means to experiment with different degree and certificate programs in an environment free from undue public and political pressure. Within a single unit of the University, innovation and experimentation with curriculum, student services, articulation among levels and types of programs, and the relationship of these to various institutions might be undertaken in ways not possible for free-standing institutions that have neither the resources, nor the shelter of the University.
2. Provide the University with a way to fulfill its commitment to expand educational opportunity for students for whom existing bachelor's degree programs are not appropriate—including many graduates of junior colleges and vocational-technical institutes, as well as individuals who, for a variety of reasons, are at a disadvantage when they enter the University.
3. Provide a unique opportunity to demonstrate the viability of the "marble cake" approach to higher education. The variety of backgrounds and experiences which General College students bring to higher education is a rich educational resource for the University. Modification of the General College to include bachelor's degree programs could establish in the State—in a critical population area—a college model whose basic education to the problems of citizens and community as these continue to change; whose students represent all segments of society; and whose programs have as their goal the individual maximizing his own potential.
4. Provide a unique opportunity to explore better ways of integrating teaching, research, and public service as the College devises new patterns of cooperation among faculty, students, and members of the community in designing educational programs not only on campus, but in the larger community.
5. Provide a unique opportunity to experiment with new ways to satisfy the liberal education requirements of the University.
6. Provide alternative ways in which Extension Division students seeking bachelor's degree might earn one.
7. Provide greater freedom for the College and its students. Having its own three-year and bachelor's programs would render the College less subject to the influence of other units of the University. GC programs could be developed on the basis of educational issues and research to a greater extent if GC students have educational alternatives other than transfer. As it now stands, the program of the College is unduly truncated both for students and for faculty.
8. Provide a different cross-college opportunity for University College students.
9. Provide, if the experiments and innovations are successful, new patterns and procedures for college programs which might be emulated by colleges and universities elsewhere.

A concluding remark. The University of Minnesota system enrolls a cross-section of the states post-high school students. Within the system are units representing the total spectrum of post-secondary education—two-year collegiate occupational and technical programs; two-year general education programs; the range of baccalaureate, professional, graduate, and post-doctoral programs. Although it would be wasteful for the University to duplicate in depth programs which can be developed and offered in other systems, as a major state and national educational resource, the University has an obligation to maintain a representative sample of all student groups and a pattern of program models designed, to meet the needs of its own students, as well as for export to other institutions. Not to do so is to abandon the marble cake concept to that of the layer cake.

It is only as a comprehensive and representative system that the University can best fulfill its state and national role. The extent to which the University becomes separatist and elitist will be the extent to which the gap is widened between the University and its constituency. As a land-grant institution, the University cannot afford to be separated from its roots in the teaching, research, and public service needs of the citizens of Minnesota. Unlike the University of the past, the University of the future may be judged distinguished not on the basis of what it has done for the few, but on the basis of what it has done for the many. As part of its program to make the University accessible to the whole spectrum of Minnesotans seeking higher education; to serve the educational needs of by-passed populations; to respond to new manpower needs as they emerge in the community; to provide additional educational opportunities for the two-year college graduate; and to experiment with ways of involving students and faculty in meaningful experiments aimed at improving college teaching and curriculum, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy moves that the Senate approve the policies and proposals in "The Development of the General College 1970-1980" and recommend that the Regents of the University authorize the Faculty of the General College to develop experimental programs leading to appropriate bachelor's degrees or certificates, such programs and degrees or certificates in each case to be submitted for Regents' approval.

3. Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy joins with the All-University Council on Liberal Education in endorsing "The All-University Policy on Liberal Education" and in recommending that the Senate approve this statement of policy.

The All-University Policy on Liberal Education

The All-University Council on Liberal Education reaffirms the aims of the policy statement passed by the Senate in 1965. After study and discussion during the 1969-70 academic year,* the Council has recast the policy statement in an effort to make the intent clearer and to elicit imaginative proposals from the colleges for the development of liberal education.

The 1965 statement was implemented throughout the University. At that time it was noted "Experience in the use of this framework may demonstrate the need for modification and the Council stands ready to undertake changes as they seem warranted." The Council presents this report in the spirit of that statement and endorses the need for future reconsideration. The proposed new statement consists of two parts: (I) Policies proposed for action, to be applied in all colleges of the University offering Bachelor's degree programs and, (II) Interpretations of the policies. Under "Policies proposed for action" attention is especially directed to the restatement of the objectives of liberal education (2 below), the invitation to colleges to propose alternative ways of achieving these objectives (3 below), and the identification of specific educational goals that colleges are asked to achieve (4 below).

*In addition to extended discussion of this policy within the Council, a seminar was convened to discuss it last February. Colleges and campuses were represented at the seminar by both faculty and student representatives. An account of that seminar and a summary of discussion is attached as an appendix to this report.

I. Policies Proposed for Action

1. All colleges should include as part of their published formulation of programs leading to the Bachelor's degree a statement concerning the objectives of liberal education and its importance in the program of the college. A model is presented in Section II of this report, but colleges may modify it to make the statement consistent with the general manner in which the college describes its purposes and programs.

2. In its broadest sense a liberal education frees us from the limitations placed by ignorance on our powers of judgment and choice. Put in another way, a liberal education leads to the acquisition of a critical awareness applicable to a wide range of problems associated with the intellectual life, with our own and other cultures, with the community, and with inter-personal relationships and self-awareness.

The ways of knowing and kinds of knowledge that mark the thought and action of the liberally educated person include some skill in managing the instruments of inquiry and communication; some significant knowledge about nature, life, society, and man's artistic and philosophic achievements; some understanding of the methods and purposes of humanists, natural scientists, and social scientists; and some command of a field of knowledge or an area of scholarly concentration.

All Bachelor's degree programs should require students to present evidence of study and/or competence leading to the general objectives outlined above. These objectives are descriptive rather than prescriptive. Since no single set of liberal education requirements will be suitable for all students, the Council welcomes proposals for alternative ways of fulfilling the objectives. The historic way of fulfillment is that of distributive study, an example of which appears in section 3(B) below, and all colleges should offer such an option among their alternatives.

3.A. Colleges are asked to furnish the All-University Council with their own ways of fulfilling the objectives. Proposals should be drawn up in such a way as to demonstrate clearly the procedures by which candidates for Bachelor's degrees will satisfy requirements for a liberal education.

The All-University Council will review proposals from colleges. Proposals will become operative when approved by the Council. The Council reserves the right to review standards for validating fulfillment of the liberal education requirements.

B. Colleges may propose fulfillment of the objectives by meeting or exceeding the requirements of the following scheme, based on four categories of knowledge and their major subdivisions, as follows:

1. Communication, Language, Symbolic Systems
 - (a) English and foreign language communication skills
 - (b) Linguistics, rhetoric, logic, and philosophical analysis
 - (c) Mathematics
2. Physical and Biological Sciences
 - (a) The physical universe
 - (b) The biological universe
3. Man and Society
 - (a) The analysis of human behavior and institutions
 - (b) The development of civilization: historical and philosophical studies
4. Artistic expression
 - (a) Literature
 - (b) The arts

The liberal education requirement should meet or exceed the following floors and/or provide procedures validating a level of student competence and understanding equivalent to that which might be reasonably achieved by effective use of the credit hour requirements.

- i. Ability to write clear and effective English prose, to be certified by the college either through an appropriate course requirement or by other means.
- ii. Ten additional courses (40-50 credits) distributed among the four categories of knowledge with no fewer than two courses (8-10 credits) in each, exclusive of courses that satisfy (i) above. There should be a clear statement of the courses acceptable for fulfilling this requirement.
- iii. Study of a subject or field in depth as a major concentration. Where appropriate some of this work can be used to satisfy part of (ii) above. Included here should be some study likely to give the student perspective on the historic and philosophical significance of the type of enterprise represented by the major concentration.

The distribution floors are not intended to be exclusive of the major. Some colleges may wish to frame their liberal education requirement by categories or subcategories lying outside the major.

In many colleges, major requirements can be used to satisfy some of the requirements of (ii) above. If, for example, a college assumes that its majors will inevitably take four courses (16-20 credits) in one of the four categories, the minimal requirement of the Council would be met by a requirement of six courses (24-30 credits) in the remaining three categories.

Where students are offered the option of fulfilling all or any part of the liberal education requirement by examination or other means, a clear description of these procedures should accompany the statement of the requirement.

4. In designing proposals for achieving liberal education, colleges are asked to study the practicality of developing policies and procedures which will help to achieve several desirable goals enumerated below—goals affirmed by discussions in the Council and in a faculty-student Seminar on All-University Policy on Liberal Education, held under Council sponsorship during winter quarter, 1970. The Council is concerned that these goals be achieved, and asks colleges to inform it as to the actions they will take in achieving these goals.

A. A commitment to and a redefinition of the role of faculty adviser: the knowledge he must possess about University programs and of the many options for satisfying the liberal education requirements; the educational promise of the adviser-advisee relationship; the development of a reward system which recognizes the importance of performing responsibly as a faculty adviser.

B. Placement of a significant part of the student's study in areas outside of his major concentration in the last two years of the student's undergraduate experience.

C. Provision for making courses available to the non-specialist, at both the lower division and the upper division level, making space available for him in courses usually reserved for majors, and, wherever feasible, removing course prerequisites.

D. Review of introductory courses, with particular attention to inclusion of current issues and concerns being addressed by experts in the field, to techniques being employed, to the values, responsibilities and rewards found in the discipline. These courses might try to be responsive to the question—what does it mean to be scholarly and expert in this field? Such review might stress avoidance, wherever possible, of omnibus, encyclopedic, or "dictionary" approaches.

E. Consideration of the offering of introductory courses appropriate for non-specialists either parallel to or the same as those courses available to prospective majors.

F. Development of interdisciplinary courses or programs, tapping the resources of University Centers or of several departments or colleges with the intent of fulfilling a broad segment of the liberal education requirement.

G. Inclusion of some study likely to assist the student in perceiving his own contemporary culture in comparison to and contrast with cultures removed in time, space, and world view.

H. Attention to the desirability of studying both the physical and biological sciences and their impact on society.

I. Development of some educationally valid curricular patterns which depart from the traditional classroom approach: off-campus independent study, scientific expeditions, internship experiences, living-learning experiences, foreign travel, directed study, etc.

J. The development of some examination techniques which depart from traditional classroom examinations: self-evaluation devices, evaluation by peers, evaluation by community experts, oral examinations, reports in the form of journals or logs, artistic compositions, musical recitals, etc.

5. These policies will be effective in fall quarter, 1970 and until such time as they are acted on by colleges and the Council, presently existing requirements will be in force. If a college faces insuperable obstacles in developing proposals for acceptance by spring quarter, 1971, it is asked to request a "delay for cause" from the All-University Council.

II. Interpretations of Section I

1. Policy Statement No. 1.

A suggested form for the statement on the purposes of liberal education follows:

The University of Minnesota believes that all of its students, whatever their area of specialization or their vocational goals, should hold in common the search for a liberal education. In the broadest sense a liberal education is one which frees us from the limitations placed by ignorance on our powers of judgment and choice. More specifically, a liberal education asks of us that we seek control over the general intellectual instruments for acquiring and communicating knowledge, primarily the instruments of language and number; that we seek understanding of the ways in which scientists contribute to man's knowledge of himself and his environment; that we seek historical and philosophic perspective on the nature of our own lives and the world in which we live; and that we seek appreciation of the creative insights into life and nature provided by literature and the arts. To help students achieve the goals of liberal education, the College of expects each student to distribute some part of his course work in areas of study other than those most closely linked to his specialized or vocational interests.

2. Policy Statement 2-A.

The Council's proposal for a liberal education requirement (see I. 3. B.) uses only the

four major categories of the system. Colleges, however, may wish to go beyond the Council's floor in specifying certain subcategories in their liberal education requirement.

3. Policy Statement 2-B.

In setting a two-course floor (8-10 credits) for each of the four major categories, the Council notes two important limitations. First, the floor may, in the judgment of a given college, be inadequate for some of the categories. The difference between the ten-course requirement and the two-course requirement for each of four categories is designed to encourage colleges to place additional emphasis at points they think particularly crucial to the liberal education of their students. Second, the two-course floor does not represent a judgment of the Council that all areas of study are of equal importance. Judgment as to the relative importance of the various categories can and should be exercised by the college faculties and may, in the presence of additional evidence, be expressed in policy proposals to the Council.

4. Policy Statement 2-C.

The colleges will furnish the Council lists of courses judged available and suitable for fulfilling requirements in any of the categories and subcategories. This listing, which will be distributed by the Council to the colleges, will serve as a guideline for colleges preparing their own requirement specifications.

4. Reported for action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy reports for action and will make recommendations at the meeting of the Senate June 4 concerning "Governance and Structure of the Health Sciences." This document will be printed in the Minnesota Daily the week beginning June 1.

R. S. HOYT
Chairman

II. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY SCHEDULE COMMITTEE

Reported for Discussion and Possible Action

The University Schedule Committee introduces the following resolution for discussion and possible action. The resolution came to the Schedule Committee from the Department of Electrical Engineering. The resolution has also been submitted to the members of the Administrative Committee.

Whereas recent national and international events have increased the awareness and interest of the student body in the political process; and

Whereas there will be a Congressional Election on November 3, 1970;

The University Senate instructs the Administrative Committee to amend the University Calendar for the Academic Year 1970-71 to advance the first day of Fall Quarter classes to September 21 and to designate the week October 26 through October 30 as Action Week. During this week there would be no regularly scheduled classes and students would be encouraged to spend their time engaging in off-campus political and social action in connection with the 1970 election campaigns.

LANDIS BOYD
Chairman

III. SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND PLANNING

Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning met fortnightly during the academic year. From a larger number of items taken up by the committee, the following are raised here as a summary of the committee's activities.

1. Change in the basic course credit module: Together with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, a proposal was developed to alter the basic course credit module from predominantly 3-credits toward a 4 or 5 credit pattern. The proposal was approved by the Senate at the March 12, 1970 meeting and is now being implemented by the various schools and colleges.

2. During the 1968-69 school year, the committee developed a procedure, called the Plan for a Plan, for determining long range (i.e. the year 2000) goals of the University of Minnesota system. Interest in this process continued and intensified during the current academic year as a variety of issues were raised and discussed in committee. An effort is to begin this summer to accomplish the essential aspects of the Plan for a Plan.

3. The St. Paul Campus Prospectus and the Kegler report were discussed at some length. Reactions to these documents were forwarded to the appropriate offices. Questions arising during the course of these discussions stimulated an appreciation of the need to develop and articulate the long range goals of the University.

4. Since the University is the only Ph.D. granting institution in the state, graduate enrollment in the University system is a key element in state wide higher education planning for 1980. A study is currently in progress, by a task force of the committee, to determine the probable structure of graduate enrollment for the year 1980.

5. At intervals, the committee scheduled meetings with the Planning office staff to monitor and react to the specific plans and projects associated with the physical planning process. (e.g. Traffic Circulation and Parking, West Bank Campus Plan, Sign and Identification Prototype Project.)

6. The committee continues to be concerned about student participation. There is provision for 5 student members on the committee and this number was appointed, but attendance has been minimal and the committee deliberations are therefore not as complete as we would wish.

The chairman expresses his appreciation to members of the committee for their constructive efforts during this academic year.

WARREN E. IBELE
Chairman

IV. UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

In accordance with the provisions of the By-laws of the University Senate, the Consultative Committee reports herewith on its activities during 1969-70.

The Consultative Committee membership is defined as follows in the Handbook:

Membership.

The University Senate Consultative Committee shall be composed of nine (9) elected members of the faculty, seven (7) elected members of the student body, and ex officio membership of the vice chairman of the University Senate. The elected faculty representatives shall comprise the Faculty Consultative Committee; the elected student representatives shall comprise the Student Consultative Committee. Procedures for the constituting of these bodies are set forth in Article III, Section 4 of the Bylaws of the University Senate.

Its duties are also specified in the Handbook:

Duties and Responsibilities.

The Senate Consultative Committee, the Faculty Consultative, and the Student Consultative Committee meeting severally or together shall serve as consultative bodies to the President. The Senate Consultative Committee shall meet with the President at least quarterly to discuss matters of policy relating to educational interests or policies of the University, personnel, service functions, and the budget. The Faculty Consultative Committee may meet separately to discuss with the President, or others, matters of primary concern to the faculty. The Student Consultative Committee may meet separately to discuss with the President, or others, matters of primary concern to the student body. Each Consultative Committee shall serve as the Executive Committee of its Senate. The Senate Consultative Committee shall serve as a coordinating committee between administrative offices and the University Senate. Each Consultative Committee shall serve in such a way that problems of concern to its Senate in the exercising of its powers and responsibilities shall be put on the agenda in a timely fashion for study, debate, and action. It shall supervise the arranging of the order of business for its Senate and the recommendations for the disposition of business which appears to be not

germane to the purposes of its Senate. Each committee may serve as a deliberative body of its Senate on major items not assigned for intensive study to other committees. With reference to the guidelines of the Constitution of the University Senate, the duties of the Consultative Committee shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. It may examine any action taken respecting the University by the Board of Regents, the various committees of the Senate, or by any other bodies or individuals related to the University.
- b. It shall consult with administrative officers on budget matters.
- c. It shall advise on procedures which involve the faculty or students in making nominations for appointments to major administrative positions.
- d. On its initiative, the Committee may make studies and recommendations to the faculty, students, or administration concerning major matters of educational policy; the President and administrative officers are encouraged to ask the committee for advice on such matters. The committee may decide whether a topic is one upon which it would wish to give advice directly or is one which should be referred to the faculty and/or students for discussion.
- e. The Committee shall receive recommendations of any faculty member or student who wishes to present any proposal before any meeting of the University Senate. The Committee may 1) place such a proposal on the agenda of the next regular meeting of the University Senate; 2) place the proposal before a special session of the University Senate called by any appropriate means; 3) refer to proposal to an appropriate Senate; 4) refer the proposal to an appropriate committee of the Senate or campus assembly, requesting study or, when appropriate, reports by joint committee sessions.
- f. The Committee shall serve as a steering committee to route to the appropriate body documents, proposals, or papers on any matter pertaining to the affairs of the University Senate. It may monitor the progress of committees on assigned tasks, and may coordinate the studies of committees regarding aspects of problems of far-reaching dimensions. When requested by the President of the University, the committee shall refer any problem of overall concern to the University to the appropriate committee, which shall then relay recommendations directly to him. In instances for which committee liaison is not specified, including appointment of special committees, the Committee shall serve as liaison between the President and the University Senate or between the President and any committee of the Senate. The President of the University is requested to notify the Consultative Committee of the creation and appointment of various all-University advisory committees. Should changes of assignment of advisory committees occur and such committees assume charges appropriate to committees of the Senate, the Consultative Committee shall advise the President and the Senate on methods of coordinating efforts.
- g. The Committee shall receive, through the clerk of the University Senate, copies of the Minutes of meetings of campus assemblies and committees of the University Senate. After due consideration, review of concerns by the appropriate Senate shall be scheduled. The Committee shall help identify items appropriate for the agenda of each Senate, and shall supervise scheduling of reports of the standing committees of the Senate on an annual basis.
- h. It is empowered to appoint subcommittees or employ other devices which it regards as appropriate in initiating and furthering communication between the faculty, students, and the President.
- i. It shall advise and supervise the University Committee on Business and Rules.
- j. It shall report regularly to the appropriate Senate on matters transacted during the year, and shall report on any matters completed, pending, or projected which, in its judgment, should be brought to the attention and consideration of the University Senate.
- k. The duties hereby conferred are not exclusive of any similar duties of other University officers or bodies.

The Consultative Committee has not met as separate bodies this year. Instead, its work has been carried on at the scheduled and special meetings of the full Senate Consultative Committee. At these meetings, problems relevant to the Twin Cities Campus, as well as problems relevant to the Duluth and Morris campuses, have been discussed.

The Senate Consultative Committee has held twelve meetings since the opening of the academic year. In addition to procedural matters and their refusal to appropriate committees of the Assembly or Senate, and in addition to the ordering of agenda materials for the Assembly and Senate, the Committee has dealt with the following problems: a change in publication of the agenda of meetings in order to plan agenda more efficiently; a policy governing the management of special meetings of the Senate or Assembly; a review of University budget plans for 1970-71, and a review of more general changes under consideration for program budgeting within the University; a consideration of the CLE and SCEP subcommittee recommendations for an educational development fund consisting of 3% of instructional budgets; a review of the reports of the University's task force on availability of educational opportunity throughout the systems of public and private higher education in the state; a plan for increased communication among the faculty, students, and administration; issues concerned with recent faculty-student concern and protest regarding Federal government decisions.

JOHN G. DARLEY
Chairman

V. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy requests consent to re-order the Docket for the meeting of the Senate, May 28, 1970, for the purpose of presenting for action an Item already printed in the Docket for the meeting of the Senate, June 4, 1970.

Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends that the Senate approve the Report to the President of the All-University Special Committee on University-ROTC Relationships, previously printed in the Minnesota Daily, May 18, 1970, subject to two amendments as follows:

First amendment: that the paragraph at the bottom of page 11 of the Report, beginning with the words "The process . . ." and ending with the words "must recognize," be deleted and that the following be substituted therefor:

Responsible consideration of the ROTC issue requires prior attention to the legitimacy and role of armed force in international relations and in conflict resolution. What we say or do about ROTC programs cannot be divorced from our convictions concerning the use of armed force. No position on ROTC can be understood unless its relation to the larger issue concerning armed force has been explicitly clarified.

A military force for national defense has traditionally appeared legitimate and proper to all except the most dedicated pacifists. However, even the defense argument for military force is, in today's world, open to serious question in view of the following problems:

1. If our "national interest" is considered to be involved in struggles between, or political changes within, large and small countries in every part of the world, the use of armed force by the United States in these struggles raises a fundamental question: When is it legitimate for a nation to defend itself or another nation?
2. By virtue of modern technological development the only absolute and certain military defense would be through world domination, since massive defensive force cannot be distinguished from massive offensive force. It is legitimate for us to maintain a military capability to insure our defense, it is legitimate for other countries to do the same. The dilemma is posed that each would have the power to destroy the other.
3. A real and present danger exists that continued dependence on the military defense concept will destroy us by the economic and psychological strains it places on us or through resentment that would inevitably accumulate in the rest of the world.
4. An ethical problem that cannot be ignored is raised by the fact that military activity causes death and grave physical or psychological injury to civilians who have a right to life, health, and happiness. Such damage to these people violates the moral standards we set for ourselves and destroys our own humanity and self-respect. The view that such damage to others is justified if it is required to prevent its happening to us is repugnant to men of conscience.

These considerations lead us to the conclusion (1) that the military approach is inadequate and extremely dangerous in our present world, and (2) that a determined search for effective non-military means and methods in the conduct of international affairs and in resolving conflict is a categorically urgent need of our times.

However, as inadequate as military solution to conflict may be, we also recognize the uncomfortable necessity for the maintenance of a stable military force until such time as our search for other methods of conflict resolution produces realistic alternatives. Decreased dependence on military force will not come rapidly and in the meantime provisions for the training of officers remains necessary.

Second amendment: that Section III. B. on pages 13-17 of the Report of the Special Committee be replaced by the following.

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy recommends that the Senate approve the following two proposals and transmit them to the President and the Board of Regents with the recommendation that they be approved and implemented without undue delay:

I. That this University join with other CIC institutions and other inter-university organizations for the purpose of concerted negotiations with the Department of Defense, as soon as possible, with a view to revision of ROTC contracts to conform with the actions recommended below.

II. That without waiting for the results of the concerted negotiations recommended in the first proposal, the Regents of the University of Minnesota approve and adopt the following statement of principles and the following action.

It is understood that the action recommendations represent goals to be realized by negotiation; that the action recommendations are to be implemented whenever possible during the period of negotiation; and that the action recommendations are to be fully implemented as soon as possible following the date on which this statement becomes the policy of the University.

1. Principles

- a) We recognize that there is such a diversity of conflicting views on the role of ROTC in the University community that no resolution of these conflicting views can be satisfactory to all;
- b) We recognize that a university has obligations to the society of which it is a part, and that these obligations can neither be dictated by society nor unilaterally defined by a university;
- c) We recognize the right of a student freely to elect an academically sound educational program leading to a bachelor's degree while at the same time participating in a military training program leading to an officer's commission;
- d) We reaffirm the proposition that the faculty alone are qualified to establish the criteria for and exercise control over the academic programs of the University;
- e) We affirm that courses, programs, and activities that do not carry credit toward a degree and that subserve military training are properly under the jurisdiction, control, and implementation of the military services, that such training courses, programs, and activities should be conducted or scheduled in such a way as not to interfere with the educational programs of participating students, and that all training programs and activities should be conducted during the summer or weekends and off campus.
- f) We affirm the proposition that the University is obligated to fund all teaching of courses carrying credit for a University degree and all student personnel services formally accepted as a part of University programs.
- g) We recognize that students enrolled in University of Minnesota ROTC programs as of the date of implementation of the policy have the right to complete ROTC programs in which they are then participating. Further we recognize that the University must honor all contractual arrangements in effect as of the date of implementation of the policy with respect to the several ROTC programs.

2. Action

The Senate authorizes, and the Senate Committee on Committees is requested to effect, the establishment of a standing student-faculty University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships. The Committee will report for administrative purposes to a committee composed of the Deans of CLA, IT, CBS, SBA, IA, Education, Law, and the Provost of the Duluth Campus and chaired in alternate years by the Deans of CLA and IT, and for academic purposes to the Senate through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy. Upon the establishment of the University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships the presently existing Campus Committee on ROTC will be abolished.

The University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships will be appointed by the usual procedures appropriate for University committees and will have the following functions (to be considered the total extent of University-ROTC relations excepting those required by existing contractual relationships and unless modified by future Senate and Regents action):

Advisory and Policy Functions:

1. To serve as an advisory committee to the Vice-President for Academic Administration with respect to inter-university policies and relations between the University of Minnesota and the Department of Defense.

2. To formulate and report to the Senate, through the Senate Committee on Educational Policy, recommendations concerning policy changes regarding University-ROTC relationships.

Operating Functions:

3. To coordinate courses offered in regular academic teaching units on approval by regular collegiate procedures which may be required as part of an officer education program. Such courses would, of course, be available to all University of Minnesota students.

4. To propose new courses, not already available in the University, which are important to military officer education programs. Such courses may be offered only as regular courses, upon usual collegiate approval.

5. To publish documents and otherwise offer advice to University of Minnesota students, registered in regular University programs who also are engaged in military officer training programs.

6. To facilitate the retention of properly qualified military personnel in the teaching of regular University courses, subject entirely to the procedures followed and standards required by the teaching unit and college offering the course.

Comment on the Operating Functions (3, 4, 5 and 6 above):

To aid the committee in its work, the services of a staff may be required. Such staff, if required, is to be provided through University funds and may consist of properly qualified military personnel.

It is understood that the above functions imply that non-University courses and activities associated with military training programs, including commissioning ceremonies and military review activities, will take place at appropriate military sites under the full administration and operation of the appropriate military service.

The University will encourage in every way the provision, by the Department of Defense, of direct financial support for students who choose to participate in a coordinated program of regular academic course work and off-campus training which would lead to a military commission at the end of, but separate from, the conclusion of baccalaureate work.

For Action

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy endorses in principle the establishment of a teaching and research unit in the field of conflict resolution. The Committee recommends that the Senate establish, through the agency of the Senate Committee on Committees, a Senate Task Force to investigate and study the feasibility and desirability of the establishment of a School, Institute, or other unit devoted to research and teaching in the field of conflict resolution, international and domestic, together with the possible relationship between such a unit and military officer education programs and the possibility or desirability of including such programs within such a unit, and to report to the Senate no later than the regular meeting of the Senate during the Winter Quarter, 1971.

ROBERT S. HOYT, CHAIRMAN
Senate Committee on Educational Policy