

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
Graduate School
Minutes of the Executive Committee
Monday, October 20, 1952
2 p.m., 331 Johnston Hall

Present: Profs. William Anderson, H. H. Arnason, Marcia Edwards, Wm. F. Geddes, Wm. G. Shepherd, Dr. M. B. Visscher: Dr. Victor Johnson of the Mayo Foundation; T. C. Blegen, presiding, and J. D. Darley; Miss Davis, secretary.

1. Dean Blegen welcomed the new members of the committee and introduced Dr. Johnson, the Director of the Mayo Foundation, whom he had invited to attend the meeting.
2. It was reported that progress is being made on the new Master of Science degree program in Urban and Regional Planning, authorized conditionally last spring by the Executive Committee without commitment as to the financial priorities of the plan over some other program and with certain changes stipulated. The program, which has been prepared in detail by a committee consisting of Professors Caplow, Anderson, Brook, Robert Jones, and Vaile, may be launched in the fall of 1953, but before it can be set in motion certain staff problems must be worked out.
3. The dean gave a brief report on graduate enrollment at the end of the second week of the fall term. Registrations total 2869, approximately a 7% decrease from the enrollment a year ago at the same time. He pointed out that veteran enrollment, which constituted 43.1% of the total in 1950 and 35.9% in 1951, has now dropped to 27.1%. The ratio of men to women in the total registration appears to be 6:1. The dean reported summer enrollments and urged the importance of continuing in 1953 relatively small classes that are essential to our graduate work and standards.
4. The dean stated he had every reason to believe that the plan of summer faculty research appointments, which has been carried forward for seven successive summers, will be continued in 1953, though the needed funds have not yet been allocated by the administration.
5. A memorandum on possible revisions of Graduate School policies and procedures was distributed to members of the committee, with enough copies to supply all members of the various group committees. These suggested revisions emanated in part from a special committee of the faculty appointed in 1950, in part from suggestions made by the group committees in 1951-52, and in part from Dean Darley on the basis of a study of our printed regulations in relation to current needs. The dean requested the chairmen of the group committees to study and discuss the proposals with their respective committees looking toward ultimate action by the Executive Committee. Dean Darley pointed out that particular items are severable, that faculty thought might result in the revision or modification of some of them or in the addition of yet other changes not included in the dittoed document. The hope was

5. (continued)

expressed that during the fall quarter progress could be made in the critical study of the proposals, but no date was designated for consideration by the Executive Committee of the recommendations from the group committees. Copies of the memorandum will be distributed also to the chairmen and members of the four special committees on American studies, biophysics, dentistry, and statistics.

6. Dr. Darley discussed the problems of Korean veterans under Public Law 550. He explained that the Graduate School would still reserve the right to make the determination of per cent ofload as it affected subsistence payments. The new law specifies that 14 credits shall be the base in the undergraduate and professional schools but the Graduate School and the faculty advisers therein will use the 12-credit base by agreement with the Bureau of Veteran Affairs and will make their subsistence recommendations on a modification of the form presently in use for Public Law 346.
7. The dean called attention to problems arising from the fact that a number of graduate students holding teaching and research assistantships seemingly do not actually register during the period of their appointments, although registration is one of the University requirements for holding such positions. It was pointed out that the stipends for such assistantships now include an amount specifically provided in order to cover tuition at the resident rate under the newly adopted policy of the University which abolished the former tuition exemption. Discussion in the committee brought out the fact that numerous other graduate students, not holding such appointments, do not register, although they use the time of advisers and various University facilities.

Further discussion included a warning against any action that might tend to discourage graduate students from taking sufficient time in their studies to do thesis research of very high quality, but it was also argued that registration and the payment of tuition by holders of appointments are a moral obligation in view both of the stated regulations of the University and the inclusion in assistantship stipends of an amount equivalent to the required resident tuition. Various inconsistencies in University fee policy touching graduate tuition, adult special status, and Extension courses were pointed out.

It was the consensus of committee opinion that the Graduate School should take the entire problem under advisement and a motion was passed authorizing the dean to appoint a committee to make a study of the problem and to present a report to the Executive Committee, with recommendations.

8. The committee voted approval of the interim action taken on August 21 through a telephone vote of the members of the Executive Committee then in residence, authorizing the appointments of two one-year faculty members in addition to the five regular members of the Social Science Group Committee, with the purpose of representing directly on that committee professional and other areas in the social sciences not included in the regular five-year appointees. This action was based on a recommendation from the faculty of the social sciences adopted at a meeting held on June 4, 1952.
9. On the basis of a recommendation proposed by a subcommittee of the Social Science Group Committee, passed by that group committee, and adopted by the social science faculty at a meeting held on June 4, it was moved and carried that the experimental program in social science for the Ph.D. degree be discontinued. Certain recommendations from the social science faculty favoring flexible Ph.D. programs which would help to meet the training needs of teachers in the social sciences were then considered by the Executive Committee, but it was felt that no formal committee action was required, since these modifications and flexibilities are possible under our present rules, with the approval of advisers and the group committee. *See attached minutes of Executive Committee.*
10. The dean reported that the nonmedical research fund now shows a balance of approximately \$4,400 in unallotted funds, and he requested committee chairmen to report such research needs as might come to their attention.
11. Dr. Shepherd called the attention of the committee to possible doctoral programs emphasizing chemical physics rather than the traditional majors now set up in electrical engineering and physical chemistry. The dean encouraged him to explore the possibility of a few experimental programs to meet the need and suggested that if they could not be worked out under present rules and Graduate School structure, they might be presented for special authorization by the Executive Committee.
12. The dean reported the action of the Administrative Committee of the Senate under date of April 25, 1952 favoring a plan for research appointments, primarily on government or other sponsored research projects, between the salary levels of research assistant and research fellow. The Administrative Committee adopted such a plan, using the title of "research fellow" for T (temporary) appointments not to be used ordinarily in cases where less than 80% of time is involved. The salary level was fixed at \$335 a month, as compared with \$385 a month for regular research fellows. Representing the Executive Committee of the Graduate School, which some time ago favored the establishment of a class of senior research assistant to meet the same need, the dean reported that he had voted "No" on the motion of approval in the Administrative Committee.

13. The dean called attention, before adjournment, to the problem of a possible re-study of our present graduate group committee structure, with a view to rearrangements in the allocations of given areas and departments among certain of the committees. He also mentioned the problem of new special interdepartmental committees which at present do not have the advantage of the over-all graduate view which comes through representation on the Executive Committee. He suggested this entire field as an area for study by the Executive Committee, since our organization is based upon conditions in the past which have been considerably changed by the great growth and development of the Graduate School. *See attached exhibit.*

On motion, adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret L. Davis

Margaret L. Davis
Secretary

JUL 9 1952

Minutes of Meeting of the Social Science Graduate School Faculty
June 4, 1952, 3:30 p.m., Ford Hall

Dr. Monachesi called the meeting to order indicating there were two items on the agenda. The first was submission of a slate of candidates for the Social Science Group Committee of the Graduate School. The Graduate Dean will consider these candidates in making committee appointments for the two vacancies that will occur this year. Dr. Monachesi explained that the Social Science Group Committee of the Graduate School traditionally consists of 5 members chosen for 5 year terms, each representing the social science disciplines plus a one year rotating membership. The 5 year term, vacant this year, has been represented by Sociology. The second vacancy was that of the rotating membership. Traditionally, the rotating membership on the Social Science Group Committee is held by a member of the faculty of Anthropology, Journalism, Library Science or Geography.

JD
I wish to have your advice before making appointments
To W.
6-12-52

Mrs. Anne Winslow Oren of the School of Social Work offered the following names for nomination; Werner W. Boehm, Gisela Konopka, John C. Kidneigh, all of the School of Social Work. A discussion sprang from these nominations around traditional representation, introducing the thought that although Sociology has represented Social Work for a number of years the situation was somewhat different at this time because of the separation of the School of Social Work from the department of Sociology, and the tremendous growth of the School of Social Work. There was some discussion pro and con as to the advisability of continuing representation of the various disciplines or research areas within the social sciences upon which the professional schools rest or separate and individual representation for each plus the professional schools. The group agreed that it was within their province to make recommendation to the Graduate Dean for consideration of this matter with special reference to the meeting of

individual needs of professional schools as well as the disciplines, the main point being that each school or discipline was best able to make appropriate appointments for doctoral committees. Dr. Chapin moved that a recommendation be transmitted to the Executive Committee and the Graduate Dean suggesting the advisability of considering enlargement of the Graduate Group Committee to contain representation from professional schools. Professor Vaile seconded the recommendation. Discussion followed this motion around whether each professional school should be represented continuously or alternately. It was decided that the motion should be left standing in its general form for full consideration of the Graduate Dean and Executive Committee. Motion was passed unanimously.

Following the passing of this motion, there was some discussion as to appropriate nominations, whether two slates should be submitted with reference to the preceding motion, making it possible for the Graduate Dean to act either in relation to traditional structure or in considering and accepting the suggestion for modification of this structure. It was decided that only one slate would be submitted, one that was broad enough, to permit the Executive Committee to make appointments according to either plan. The following persons were nominated for consideration; George Vold, Sociology; Don Martindale, Sociology; John C. Kidneigh, Social Work; Werner W. Boehm, Social Work; Gisela Konopka, Social Work; J. Edward Gerald, Journalism; W. Edwin Emery, Journalism. A motion was made and seconded to accept the nominations. Motion was passed unanimously.

The next major subject for discussion was a report of the Social Science Ph.D. Program Sub-Committee of the Social Science Group Committee of the Graduate School. Dr. Monachesi called upon Dr. Vold, a member of the committee, for comments on the report. Dr. Vold made several general remarks in relation to the report, recommending its adoption. In addition he brought out a suggestion that had come

to him from Dr. Vaile, suggesting that with the enlargement of the minor program some consideration should be given to the major field requirements with control for this seated in the major advisor for final approval. Dr. Vaile urged that in allowing substitution of competence in several areas for competence in a single area some consideration should be given to reduction in major area requirement. Dr. Chapin brought out some of the administrative problems involved in this kind of a program and suggested that under the proposed plan the candidate might facilitate working through these problems by arranging a joint meeting between major and minor advisors. A motion was made and seconded approving the report and requesting transmittal of the report to the Graduate Dean for consideration and for action of the Executive Committee. Motion was passed.

Dr. Chapin in an informal discussion commended the sub-committee for its efficient and exhaustive report and went on to discuss specific areas of the report. He emphasized the difficulties that were usually encountered in crossing disciplinary lines and working toward integration, cited examples of these problems and difficulties, brought out the fact that integration was not a purely intellectual process, that it could not be taught, that it was something that must occur within the individual, that it was part of the maturation process and time was an important factor in it. He suggested the possibility of 2 or 3 disciplines beginning the work of integration in light of past experiences and the difficulties that had been encountered when a number of disciplines had attempted to work out integration.

Dr. Darley spoke briefly to the group outlining immediate plans of the Graduate School. He stated that one of the immediate concerns seems to be around planning for use of the remainder of the Ford Foundation Funds and simplification of Graduate School ~~administration~~ procedures.

It was agreed that copies of the minutes should be sent to members of the group committee and to social science department chairman.

Respectfully submitted,

Helen J. Yesner
Acting Secretary

HJY:jml

REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON
EVALUATION OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE
MAJOR FOR THE PH.D. DEGREE

(Submitted to the Social Science Group Committee and)
(the Graduate Faculty in Social Science, Spring 1952)

This report is in four parts: (I) Origin and work of the present sub-committee; (II) Review of the present experimental program; (III) Basic problems in a general social science major program; (IV) Desirable future developments.

I. ORIGIN AND WORK OF THE PRESENT SUB-COMMITTEE

The graduate faculty in the social sciences on June 13, 1951 adopted the following resolution:

"The faculty has a continuing interest in experimenting with interdepartmental programs with an opportunity for a Ph.D. major. The Chairman of the Social Science Group Committee for 1951-52 is requested to appoint an interdepartmental committee to consider the need for such a program (social science major for the Ph.D.), the organization of the program, and its administration. This committee will advise with the Group Committee during the year of 1951-52 and will report to the meeting of the faculty in the social sciences in the spring of 1952."

Pursuant to this resolution, Professor Monachesi (Chairman, Social Science Group Committee for the year 1951-52) named the following sub-committee:

Professor Arthur E. Naftalin, Political Science
" Andreas G. Papandrea, Business Administration
" Lawrence D. Steefel, History
" John C. Weaver, Geography
" George B. Vold, Sociology (Chairman)

The sub-committee met four times in full two to three hour sessions. At one meeting it had the advantage of sharing views with Deans T. C. Blegen, R. M. Cooper and H. T. Morse, and Professor E. D. Monachesi. In addition, considerable time was given to study of graduate school records related to the existing program.

Copies of a special report on the Social Science Major for the Ph.D., prepared in 1950 by Professor Naftalin at the request of Dean Blegen, were made available and proved most useful. Part of Professor Naftalin's report is attached to this report and circulated for the information of the graduate faculty.

The Director of the Bureau of Institutional Research made available some of its findings from the presently in progress extensive survey of the attitudes and opinions of Minnesota Ph.D.'s with reference to their own graduate training. This material has been useful in helping to determine sub-committee views in light of this more general perspective.

II. REVIEW OF THE PRESENT EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM

The present program was initiated by Professor Edgar B. Wesley to meet what he thought was a genuine demand for broadly trained supervisors of Social Studies Teachers in the public schools. The underlying thought was that such supervisors should hold the Ph.D. degree and that they should be trained in social science rather than in Education.

Examination of graduate school records makes clear the fact that as the program has functioned and as it is now operating it serves no particular need and is of no particular significance to anyone. A brief review of the principal facts about this operation will make the above conclusion more nearly self-evident.

To date, it seems legitimate to include ten students as participating in, or as having participated in the program. Seven have submitted three-year programs that have been approved, and of these, six have come up for oral preliminary examinations. Three passed and three failed on the first try. Of the failures, one has come up for a second oral and passed. The other two have not yet attempted a second trial. In other words, of the six who attempted the oral preliminary examination, four passed and two failed. Of the four who passed the preliminary examination, two completed their work and received the Ph.D. degree. The other two are presumably completing work on their theses but there is no current information on probable expectations as to time before completion.

Perhaps due to the conditions under which the program was initiated, it has apparently attracted for the greater part people whose interests are primarily in education. Thus, of the six thesis topics approved for these candidates, in every case the statement seems to point up educational problems rather than problems in the social sciences. Inspection of the statements, given below, will make this clear.

Hallman, George H., "The Content and Interrelations of Social Science Courses in General Education Programs of Selected Colleges in the South". (Prelim passed, June 1950)

Lundquist, Ben, "The History of Elementary Education in Sweden". (Prelim failed, 1950)

Matlon, John C., "Official Government Control of Education in Japan, 1931-1941". (Prelim failed, 1949)

McLendon, Jonathan, "A Process of Deriving a Social Studies Curriculum from National Purposes". (Prelim passed 1950; degree 1951)

Schuhle, William, Jr., "Community Analysis as a Basis of a College Social Studies Curriculum". (Prelim failed 1950; 2nd prelim passed 1951)

Wronski, Stanley P., "The Use of Government Publications in Social Studies Teaching". (Prelim passed 1949; degree received, Aug 1950)

Evaluating this program, four principal difficulties appear to have shaped its development:

- (a) It provided opportunity for graduate students with a collection of miscellaneous course credits in several fields to transform this miscellany into a "program in social science" with the justification that it makes up in breadth for its lack of depth in any field. Such "floater" students, who have frequently "shopped around" the academic bargain counters, are usually not people of any specially high competence. The program appears to have attracted, not people of exceptional ability, but rather average, routine, non-imaginative plodders who find it easier to accumulate miscellaneous course credits than to work out, relatively independently, research projects or thesis requirements.
- (b) It has, therefore, been unusually difficult to satisfy ordinary thesis requirements, either in the formulation of topic or in the carrying out of research. This is due, perhaps, to the absence of any general or common social science research methodology that can be applied to an "integrated" problem involving several of the social sciences. Research is an aspect of specialization and it is obviously difficult, if not impossible, to be a specialist in generality.
- (c) The absence of any definite, unified machinery for administering the program has tended to make it diffuse and uncertain in operation. Uncertainty as to whose judgment should be taken in planning student programs and in getting departmental approvals has probably further discouraged students who might otherwise have been attracted to the idea of genuine interdepartmental training in the social sciences.
- (d) The absence of any clear statement of basic requirements, either as to prerequisite training or as to level of ability or proficiency, has added to the general confusion and has brought in, apparently, a group of students of no great promise and of only mediocre accomplishments.

III. BASIC PROBLEMS IN A GENERAL SOCIAL SCIENCE MAJOR

The sub-committee's discussions centered around the following questions:

1. Is a Ph.D. program in social science necessary in order to fill a need which is not being presently met by existing programs?

Those who urge the further development of the Ph.D. program in social science argue that an increasing number of colleges are seeking personnel specifically trained for managing and instructing in general education courses in social science and for directing social studies programs that involve familiarity with a number of different social science disciplines. It is also argued that the growing interest in interdisciplinary research is creating a demand for more generally-trained social scientists as opposed to narrowly-trained discipline specialists.

The committee reviewed the memorandum, prepared for the Graduate School by Mr. Naftalin, which dealt directly with the question of whether colleges were currently eager to employ instructors with the "broader" type of preparation such as is suggested by the Ph.D. in social science. Replies to a letter of inquiry sent by Dean Blegen to a selected group of college presidents indicated that a majority of those responding did favor some type of more general training, but there was a sharp division of opinion, and the evidence, in the sub-committee's view, was not conclusive that colleges are at this stage eagerly seeking instructors who offer the general social science major.

The sub-committee's informal discussions revealed that some colleges are seeking instructors who are qualified to teach general education courses but inquiries of this sort almost always indicate that the colleges are seeking instructors who offer major preparation in one of the traditional disciplines.

The sub-committee observed that there is so much diversity in general education programs in the social sciences that it is almost impossible to define what should appropriately be regarded as proper preparation in this field. While there is a great deal of interest among colleges in the development of programs of general education, there is, as yet, no crystallized agreement as to what a "social science major" should necessarily include.

Insofar as interdisciplinary research is concerned, the sub-committee was unanimous in the view that further progress in this area is not likely to result from the development of a general social science Ph.D. major but rather through the modifications of existing programs that permit a somewhat larger opportunity for interdepartmental seminars and research experiments.

It was the unanimous view of the sub-committee that existing programs can be modified in a fashion that will meet whatever need now exists or is likely to develop in the near future for instructors more broadly trained than is traditionally the case under present arrangements.

2. What is the professional future of persons trained in a program of this sort?

The sub-committee was impressed with certain serious dangers that the development of a Ph.D. in social science may create.

Specifically, the sub-committee points to the fact that a social science major does not have a professional base. As a general social scientist, his interests, of necessity, must be so diffuse and cover so many different fields of subject matter that he is likely to become isolated from any significant organized professional group.

A candidate for this degree may very likely find himself something of an "orphan." Social science departments generally are not likely to assume responsibility for either his training or placement, with the result that he becomes professionally isolated and with no effective supervision of his graduate work. While admittedly adequate machinery might be set up to guarantee supervision of his work by a committee of several faculty members, the problem would still remain that the candidate does not have a formal and established departmental connection, which will be of vital concern to him in his future professional career.

Training for a social science major leads inevitably, in the sub-committee's view, to a scattering of course preparation over several disciplines. While both breadth and depth are desirable objectives in graduate instruction, the kind of program necessarily called for by a social science major is most likely to result in the lowering of scholastic standards and a heightening of superficiality in preparation.

3. Is the development of a meaningful social science major feasible within the existing framework of graduate study?

However organized and directed, a program leading to a social science major inevitably must involve the selection of certain courses now offered by separate departments. The sub-committee recognizes that, with the development of interdepartmental and interdisciplinary seminars, the future may yield a framework of graduate study that would make a social science major a feasible objective.

Within the existing framework, however, the sub-committee believes that any effort to develop a social science major will inevitably result in a "spread" and "scatter" which will leave the candidate with only a most limited mastery of several discrete courses. The members of the committee hold strong doubts that any particular grouping of courses would overcome this basic defect. Whatever the program requirements may be, a candidate is not likely to develop a meaningful program that is anchored to significant social science theories and data. The candidate, moreover, will constantly find himself called upon to perform at a level required of candidates who are taking their major concentration in a traditional discipline.

It is not unlikely, in the sub-committee's view, that the future may see the development of genuine interdisciplinary courses and that the time may come when integrated, interdepartmental work is available in such quality and quantity as to justify the creation of a special social science major for the Ph.D. As the social sciences are taught today, however, there is no field that may be properly labeled social science for the purposes of an advanced doctoral degree.

Is it possible to achieve "integration" by combinations of courses that provide breadth of training (i.e., contact with and knowledge of content of basic courses in several fields)? Or does integration develop as an aspect of research and the discovery of new knowledge,

new relations, and new understandings, common to several of the social science specialties? The sub-committee has no specific information on this question but it has been impressed with some recent developments involving certain kinds of integration:

- (a) Bio-physics -- a real integration of physics and biology. This appears to have developed out of research and new knowledge and not as a result of broader training (more courses) in either physics or biology as such. It should be noted that the new integration has become a separate specialty.
- (b) Social-psychology -- what integration there is in this field, too, has grown out of new, common knowledge in research and not out of broader training (more courses) in either psychology or sociology. Again, the new integration is in process of becoming a new specialty.
- (c) Social-geography or human geography -- integration has come from research on common problems, the fitting of a population into its natural habitat, and not from breadth of training (courses) involving the several fields. This, too, has become a new specialty rather than an over-all synthesis of knowledge about man and his environment.

How can be brought about a more rigid selection of students in graduate programs in general studies so that the genuinely superior and exceptionally able will be attracted rather than the diffuse, mediocre type? This latter type is often attracted by sweeping generalizations about very general problems but is not equipped for the laborious task of detailed scrutiny of the many specific aspects involved in all broad generalizations. Something more than an expression of interest in interdisciplinary training is necessary if the program is to avoid the burden of students who are not able to do first rate graduate work. To avoid mediocrity hiding behind the mask of "general competence but no specialization," machinery will be needed to screen all applicants through a system of uniform procedures involving:

- (a) A uniform battery of standardized tests of ability and aptitude, with general adherence to established "cutting" scores.
- (b) A single admissions officer (or committee) to insure uniform and consistent judgment of past educational achievement and uniform interpretation of particular individual requirements.
- (c) High scholastic performance (B or better) in a group of core courses uniformly required of all students in the program.

4. Is a program of this sort administratively feasible, assuming its desirability?

Reference has already been made to the fact that candidates under this kind of program become "orphans," insofar at least as the social

science departments are concerned. An administrative mechanism might be conceivably established that would give these candidates a satisfactory "home" - in the form of a supervisory or examining committee.

This sub-committee is impressed, however, by the fact that the existing departments are still the main operating centers of the University graduate program, and that only they are equipped to give adequate supervision to progress in course work and in general scholastic growth and to relate such extra class work as that performed by teaching assistants and part-time instructors to their programs of study.

The sub-committee is fearful that any kind of administrative device that may be established, which is separate from the established departments, is not likely to be effective in providing continuous and meaningful guidance for graduate study in the social sciences. If the candidate is to have a single adviser - in the fashion of the traditional programs - it is not at all unlikely that his work will reflect the specialized interest of his adviser, and the candidate, in the end, will not be distinguishable from other advisees in the same discipline; thus the program will not have achieved its objective of an integrated, cross-discipline preparation. On the other hand, if the candidate is to be advised by a committee of three or more persons, he will be laboring under almost impossible work conditions, and those who serve as advisers must expect to devote an unusually large amount of time in such supervision, with the candidate running the risk of having to deal constantly with a committee whose personnel is changing and with divided counsel as to what constitutes a satisfactory program.

It is the unanimous opinion of the sub-committee that, in terms of administration, the creation of a program of this sort presents problems that will be extremely difficult to surmount.

5. What views do present holders of the Ph.D. degree have about the adequacy of their own graduate training, and in what ways would they change their training if they could do it again?

The Bureau of Institutional Research has undertaken a study of Minnesota Ph.D.'s. between the years 1935 and 1949 which throws some light on part of the question with which this committee has been concerned. The results of the study have not yet been subjected to complete analysis, but some of the material was made available to the members of this committee. Responses were available from 624 Ph.Ds. engaged in teaching and from 509 in non-teaching activities (mostly government or business) on the significant question of whether, with reference to "use in present position," the characteristic of graduate education specified in the following table was considered to be "essential" or "valuable."

Attitudes toward Certain Characteristics of Graduate Education. (From Table 12)

Characteristic	"Essential"		"Valuable"	
	Teaching	Non-teaching	Teaching	Non-teaching
Thorough command of major field or specialty	89.3%	78.0%	97.0%	95.1%
Extensive knowlege of a minor or related field	46.5%	32.6%	91.8%	80.6%
Extensive knowledge of fields besides major and minor	24.4%	24.4%	73.1%	72.5%

Without entering into any involved discussion of the significance of these statistical findings, it seems fair to conclude that in the experience of the presently employed Minnesota Ph.Ds., both in teaching and non-teaching activities, their functioning is as specialists with principal responsibility for a major field. Hence, the largest proportion of both groups say that knowledge in a major field is both "essential" and "valuable." Command of a minor field gets notably fewer indicators as "essential," though many say it is "valuable." Extensive knowledge of fields other than major and minor is noted as "essential" by less than one-fourth of the respondents, both teaching and non-teaching. The inference seems warranted that specialists find their training as specialists much more important for their present jobs than otherwise desirable aspects of general education.

The statistical information quoted above is not directly applicable to the problem of the social science major as training for the specific purpose of supplying personnel for the implementation of such courses. It does suggest, however, that in the general placement of holders of the Ph.D. degree, the training as specialists in a major field is felt by the overwhelming majority to be the most important aspect of their graduate training.

IV. DESIRABLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS.

In the light of the foregoing observations, the sub-committee unanimously supports the following as desirable developments for the immediate future:

1. The present experimental program leading to the Ph.D. with a major in general social science should be discontinued. Students presently involved in the program should be given opportunity to complete their work, without prejudice, under the existing program or under a subsequently developed one, whichever is deemed most desirable for them.

2. While the University of Minnesota should not reject the possibility of developing a more systematically organized and more uniformly administered program of graduate training in interdepartmental social science, the committee has reached the unanimous conclusion that in practice the training should include the following:

- a. A major in one of the recognized disciplines, perhaps reduced from existing requirements to permit more work in the minor (e.g., in history 4 in place of the present 5 fields. The committee calls attention to the fact that in a number of cases that are somewhat parallel to the idea of a Ph.D. in social science, that is the Russian Institute at Columbia and similar programs elsewhere, the student is expected to take a normal Ph.D. in one of the recognized disciplines.)
- b. It is desirable, but should not be required, that the thesis involve the use of methods, materials, and concepts of more than one of the social sciences.
- c. There should be a split minor, augmented in the same proportion that the major may be reduced.
- d. Introduction to the methods and concepts of an additional discipline in lieu of time normally spent in the graduate school in work on the second language.

3. The preliminary examination should include a special written examination in the subject matter of each of the "minor" fields.

4. Since the program in social science is designed, in part at least, for the preparation of college teachers of social science, provision should be made for the systematic "in-service" training of the more advanced candidates as teaching assistants (possibly as instructors) in the University's established undergraduate courses in social science. Details of such a program would have to be subject to general administrative discretion depending upon many unforeseen factors to supply and demand. Such a general policy, however, should be adopted and applied as far as possible.

5. Encouragement should be given the development of interdepartmental and interdisciplinary graduate courses.

6. A continuing sub-committee appointed by the group committee should be created for the purpose of giving further study to the problems of Ph.D. preparation and to urging the various social science departments to evaluate their separate Ph.D. programs towards the end that modifications such as are suggested in this report are carried out.

MEMORANDUM

To: The Chairmen and Members of the Graduate Group Committees and Special Committees.

From: Theodore C. Blegen, Dean

Gentlemen:

In January, 1950, I appointed a special committee of the Graduate Faculty to consider some of the long-range fiscal and administrative problems we faced in view of heavy enrollments and heavy participation of faculty members in all phases of graduate instruction and supervision of research. The members of the committee were: Professors W. W. Cook, chairman, W. G. Shepherd, J. B. Wolf, F. G. Wallace, W. F. Geddes, and W. W. Spink.

During the balance of that year, and during 1950-51, the committee became heavily involved in the problem of changes of Graduate School tuition policy, since legislative action on the University's biennial request appeared to demand some attention to this problem. Because of the high priority of this matter, other recommendations of the committee could not be presented for faculty review until 1951-1952.

Last year, therefore, I placed in the hands of the various Group Committees the additional recommendations of this faculty committee for review. These recommendations were five in number:

1. The final examinations for the Master's degree, Plan A, may be written or oral or both;
2. The preliminary examination committee for the Ph.D. may have a minimum of five members;
3. The Ph.D. thesis committee may have a minimum of three members;
4. The candidate must submit a one-page thesis outline at the same time as he submits his thesis title blank;
5. Routine petitions for foreign language exemption, change of degree programs, and similar matters need not be reviewed by the Group Committees.

In informal discussions last year, the first four of these recommendations were accepted by the various Group Committees, and the fifth was rejected.

The acceptance of recommendations in principle, however, still requires that present Graduate School regulations be redrafted to conform to the spirit and letter of the new rules. I have, therefore, asked Mr. Darley to undertake this task and, at the same time, to clarify certain other parts of our Graduate School Bulletin in a manner that seemed to him wise in view of his responsibility for periodic checks on student progress.

We now place in your hands, for action this year, redrafts of regulations and statements in our Bulletin both to conform to the recommendations of the faculty committee and to bring to your attention other changes which might

be warranted. There are ten items on the enclosed material, each of which is a distinct and severable item for your consideration. Will you be kind enough to consider these in special meetings of your committees so that they may come before the Executive Committee at an early date?

**SUGGESTED REVISIONS IN GRADUATE SCHOOL PROCEDURAL AND POLICY STATEMENTS
REGARDING VARIOUS DEGREE REQUIREMENTS AS PRESENTLY PUBLISHED IN THE 1932-
1934 BULLETIN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL.**

The following suggestions are presented for consideration and action by the various Group Committees of the Graduate School. The recommendations from the Group Committees will then be presented for review to the Executive Committee of the Graduate School.

The revisions serve one of several possible functions: clarification of present statements; elimination of ambiguities or loopholes in interpreting standards of scholastic performance to students; changes in actual procedures for the award of graduate degrees, designed to maintain our present high standards but to simplify the great volume of work created by present and future enrollment loads.

The revisions are severable and separate, for purposes of review by the Group Committees. They follow also the general principle of permissive regulations, rather than mandatory regulations, to the end that the various Group Committees may have flexibility in meeting the problems of their fields.

In each instance, the present statement from the Bulletin is quoted, followed by the suggested revision, with a word about its purpose and source.

1. On pages 7-8 of the 1932-34 Bulletin the following statement appears:

THE TWO PLANS FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE

Preliminary Statement—It is assumed in the plans outlined below that the student who is adequately prepared and giving full time to study will, if he meets the requirements for quality in class, thesis, and final general examinations, complete the requirements for the Master's degree in one academic year* or its equivalent in Summer Sessions. Those who lack adequate preparation, hold assistantships involving considerable services to the University, or who do other work in self-support will find the period in residence proportionately lengthened. It is not usual for the ablest, sturdiest, and best-prepared students to absorb the requirements satisfactorily within one year, even when the departmental service is limited to three hours weekly in conducting quizz and discussion divisions of large elementary courses or ten hours weekly in laboratory supervision or its equivalent in reading quizz papers. Assistants must expect completion of the thesis and examinations to extend beyond the minimum one-year period. The same limitations apply to those who lack satisfactory command of spoken and written English or reading knowledge of those modern languages that are necessary tools in so

many fields of graduate work.

*Certain programs for the Master's degree, including the program in social work, require more than one academic year.

The following revision is suggested as corresponding more closely with the facts, and as being therefore a more accurate statement for the guidance of students:

Preliminary statement—In the plans outlined below, it is theoretically possible for the student who is adequately prepared and who can devote full time to graduate study to complete the requirements for the Master's degree in one academic year of three quarters, or its equivalent in summer sessions. An analysis of the records of people who have received the Master's degree indicates, however, that the completion of a Master's program ordinarily takes an average of five to six quarters in residence, or its equivalent in summer sessions. Students who are planning for the Master's degree under either Plan A or Plan B, therefore, should take into account this customary rate of progress, as well as the minimum possible time interval of one academic year. If such matters as self-support, prerequisite work, or special study of foreign languages (or English for foreign students) are involved in attaining the Master's degree, students should plan for the longer period of residence.

2. On page 8 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statement appears:

PLAN A: THE MASTER'S DEGREE WITH THESIS

Major and Minor Work—In choosing a field for major or minor work, the candidate must present the minimum undergraduate preparation prescribed in the departmental statements. He must complete in the Graduate School a minimum of 18 quarter credits in the major department and 9 in the minor with a grade not lower than B in any course offered as fulfilling the requirements in the major, and a grade not lower than C in minor courses. No graduate credit is allowed for course work of D quality.

The student's work for the minor must be logically related to his major work. The dean and the group committee may in exceptional cases allow the minor subject to be taken in the same department as that of the major.

All requirements for the Master's degree under Plan A must be completed within six years after the initiation of the degree program, except in social work where the time limit is eight years for the master of arts with a major in social work.

The following revision is suggested, the first part of which will provide both the adviser and the Group Committee with a means of controlling, if they wish, those situations in which students carry a great many credits until they can pull out a minimum program which barely meets the scholastic average specified. The second part of the revision is designed primarily to clarify and make explicit present procedures involved in transfer of credit toward the Master's degree and overall time limit for earning the degree.

At the end of the first paragraph cited above from page 8, add the following statement:

In cases where the student takes course work beyond the minimum requirements stated above, both the adviser and the Graduate Group Committee may demand comparable standards of performance in this additional work, in evaluating and approving the minimum program submitted, and may reject the minimum degree program if the additional work falls substantially below B grades in the major field and C grades in the minor field.

For the third paragraph cited above from page 8, substitute the following statement:

All requirements for the Master's degree under Plan A must be completed within six years, except for the degree in social work. The time limit is eight years for the Master of Arts degree, Plan A, with a major in social work. The six-year period specified includes all work transferred to the graduate record of the individual, regardless of whether this transferred work was taken at another institution, as an adult special student at the University of Minnesota, or under any other conditions in which transfer is permitted.

3. On page 9 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statement appears:

The candidate shall present to the Dean of the Graduate School, not later than the close of the second quarter of residence, a certificate of proficiency in the designated language, signed by the professor in charge of the corresponding language department or his representative.

The following revision is suggested as corresponding more nearly with the actual situation and as creating a situation that can be effectively supervised by the Graduate School office.

The candidate shall present to the office of the Graduate School a certificate of proficiency in the designated language before he may be admitted to the written or oral examinations required for this degree. The certificate

must be signed by a representative of the appropriate foreign language department.

4. On page 10 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statement appears:

Besides the usual course examinations, where such are given, the candidate for the Master's degree must pass a final written examination in the major and, after acceptance of the thesis, a final oral examination.

The final written examination will be held not later than four weeks (for June commencement five weeks) before the end of the quarter in which he takes his degree. It will cover the work of the candidate in the field of the major, and may include any work fundamental thereto. This examination will be held by his instructors in the major department, the adviser acting as chairman.

If the final written examination is satisfactory and the thesis accepted, and any language requirement absolved, the final oral examination of the candidate will be held not later than four weeks (for June commencement five weeks) before the end of the quarter in which he takes his degree. The thesis committee, with the adviser as chairman, conducts the oral examination. The chairman may invite to the examination any instructors with whom the candidate has had work. The head or chairman of the department in which the major work is done is an ex-officio member of the committee. Any member of the graduate faculty may attend as a visitor. The final oral examination (normally of not more than one hour's duration) will cover all the work offered for the degree, and may include other work fundamental thereto. At the close of the examination, the committee will vote upon the candidate, taking into account all of his work. A majority vote is required for approval. The chairman of the committee will then report the result of the vote to the Graduate School office.

The following revision was suggested by the special committee appointed during 1950-51 to study changes in Graduate School procedures, and has already been given tentative approval by Group Committees during 1951-52. It is presented now for further study. In effect, it makes the examination requirements for the two Master's degrees parallel, and permits greater flexibility in evaluating students' work for these two degrees.

In addition to the usual course examinations, the candidate for the Master's degree must pass a final written examination, a final oral examination, or both, at the discretion of his examining committee.

6

If a final written examination only is specified, it must be held not later than four weeks (for a June commencement, five weeks) before the end of the quarter in which he takes his degree. It will cover the work of the candidate in the major field, and may include any work fundamental thereto. This examination will be administered by the chairman of the examining committee in conjunction with the graduate faculty of the major department, and its result will be reported to the Graduate School office on the appropriate form.

If a final oral examination only is specified, it also must be held not later than four weeks (for a June commencement, five weeks) before the end of the quarter in which the student takes his degree. This examination will be conducted by the committee appointed to examine the thesis, with the major adviser serving as chairman, and will cover all the work offered for the degree, including any work fundamental thereto. At the close of the examination, the committee will vote upon the candidate's performance, and a majority vote is required for approval. The chairman of the committee will then report the result of the vote to the Graduate School office on the appropriate form.

If both a written and an oral examination are specified, the written examination must precede the oral examination and the time limit for the oral examination indicated above must be adhered to.

5. On page 12 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statements appear:

Under Plan B candidates for the Master's degree must complete, with an average of B, a minimum of 45 quarter credits in graduate courses. No graduate credit is allowed for course work of D quality. At least 21, and not more than 27, of the 45 credit hours should be in a single field of concentration. Not less than 18 of the 45 credits should be offered in at least two related fields. At least 9 quarter credits either in the field of concentration or in related fields must be in advanced courses, courses identified in this bulletin by an asterisk, seminars, or independent work under faculty supervision and requiring the preparation of written reports representing the quality but not the range of the Master's thesis.

All requirements for the Master's degree under Plan B must be completed within seven years after the initiation of the degree program, except in social work where the time limit is nine years for the master of arts with a major in social work and seven years for the degree of master of social work.

Under this plan the graduate group committee in charge of his field of concentration shall appoint a committee of not less than three to test each candidate by oral or written examination or both. The adviser will make available to the examining committee for their review the papers prepared in starred courses to fulfill the requirement of nine hours of independent work. At their option the group committee may call for and examine these

written reports submitted to meet the nine-hour requirement.

The student is asked to call at the Graduate School office, before his final examinations for the degree, to get an examination report form for signatures of the examining committee.

The following revisions parallel those suggested in items 2 and 4 above and are designed to accomplish the same purposes as those made in items 2 and 4.

At the end of the first paragraph cited above from page 12, add the following statement:

In cases where the student takes course work beyond the minimum requirements stated above, both the adviser and the Graduate Group Committee may demand comparable standards of performance for this additional work, and may reject the minimum degree program if the additional work falls substantially below the B average required for the Plan B degree.

For the second paragraph cited above from page 12, substitute the following statement:

All requirements for the Master's degree under Plan B must be completed within seven years, except for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in social work, Plan B, where the time limit is nine years. The seven-year period specified above includes all work transferred to the graduate record of the individual, regardless of whether this transferred work was taken at another institution, as an adult special student at the University of Minnesota, or under any other conditions in which transfer is permitted.

For the third paragraph cited above from page 12, substitute the following statement, in order to set the parallelism in examining procedures for the two Master's degrees:

Under this plan the candidate will be examined by a committee of not less than three, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School upon recommendation of the appropriate Group Committee. This examination may be written or oral or both, at the discretion of the examining committee. Procedures for the examinations are the same as those already described for the Master's degree, Plan A.

7. On page 14 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statement appears:

The student shall also file with his adviser's approval the title of his Doctor's dissertation on a blank that he obtains in the Graduate School office.

The following revision was suggested by the special committee

appointed during 1950-51 to study changes in Graduate School procedures, and has already been given tentative approval by Group Committees during 1951-52. It is presented now for further study. It is designed to aid the Group Committees in choosing examining committees for theses by providing a better idea of the student's research plan.

The student shall also file with his adviser's approval the title of his Doctor's dissertation on a blank that he obtains in the Graduate School office, and at the same time shall present a typed outline, not to exceed one page, of his research plan.

8. On page 17 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statement appears:

The thesis will be examined by a committee of not less than four, appointed by the Graduate School. The student's adviser will as a rule be chairman of this committee. Unanimous approval of the thesis by the committee is necessary, and the chairman of the committee will report the results to the Graduate School office.

The following revision was suggested by the special committee appointed during 1950-51 to study changes in Graduate School procedures, and has already been given tentative approval by Group Committees during 1951-52. It is presented now for further study, and should be considered integrally with changes suggested later for the examinations for the Ph.D. degree. It reduces the thesis examining committee to a three-man minimum committee, rather than a four-man minimum committee.

Before a candidate may appear for his final oral examination, the thesis will be read by a committee of not less than three, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, upon recommendation of the appropriate Group Committee. The student's major adviser will as a rule be chairman of this committee. Unanimous approval of the thesis by this committee is necessary before the final oral examination can be held, and the chairman of the thesis examining committee will report the results of the review of the thesis to the Graduate School office on appropriate forms available in that office.

9. Under present regulations, the Graduate School office is not officially informed of the student's performance on preliminary written examinations. There are certain occasions when this information would be of value, and we are suggesting that the following statement be added at the end of the second line at the top of page 18 of the 1952-54 Bulletin:

The results of this written examination shall be reported by the major adviser to the Graduate School office on forms which the student may obtain in that office. In case of failure, the candidate will normally be allowed only one opportunity to retake the failed examination, and this opportunity will be permitted not earlier than the following regular school term.

10. On page 18 of the 1952-54 Bulletin the following statement appears:

Preliminary Examination—At least seven months before the degree is conferred, following the completion of the minor and the language requirements, a preliminary examination of the student shall be given by the thesis committee plus at least two members appointed by the dean. The student's adviser will act as chairman. The chairman or head of the major department is ex officio a member of any examining committee for an advanced degree. This committee must not be fewer than six, of whom five shall constitute a quorum. To pass the preliminary examination requires a two-thirds affirmative vote of the examining committee with a minimum of four affirmative votes. The examination shall cover the graduate work taken by the student, and may include any work fundamental thereto, except the thesis and the special field reserved for the final examination. This examination shall be in addition to the usual course examinations. Only after passing this examination may the student be enrolled as a candidate for the Doctor's degree. Students failing this preliminary examination may be excluded from candidacy for the degree and in any case shall not be re-examined until at least one quarter has passed. Preliminary examinations will not be given during the period of final examination for the June commencement—normally from about April 8 to May 6—or during the second term of the Summer Session. They must be scheduled in the office of the Graduate School one week in advance.

Final Oral Examination—After successful completion of the written examinations and acceptance of the thesis and not less than four weeks (for June commencement five weeks) before graduation, the final oral examination shall be given. This examination shall be conducted by a committee consisting of the adviser as chairman, the members of the thesis committee, and at least two other members of the graduate faculty appointed by the dean. At least one member of this committee shall represent the University outside the major and minor fields of the student. This examination covers the thesis and the field of the candidate's special studies and shall not exceed three hours. The final oral examination must be scheduled in the office of the Graduate School one week in advance.

The date of the final oral examination shall be publicly announced, and any member of the graduate faculty may attend. Upon completion of the examination, a formal vote of the committee shall be taken, and a unanimous affirmative vote of the members shall be necessary for recommendation of the candidate for the degree. The chairman of the committee will then report the result of the vote to the Graduate School office.

All Ph.D. candidates are required to register in the quarter in which their final oral examination is taken.

Reports--Special blanks are provided for signed reports on the preliminary examination, the thesis, and the final oral examination. The thesis and final oral reports must be filed in the office of the dean of the Graduate School at least four weeks (for June commencement five weeks) before graduation.

The following revisions were suggested by the special committee appointed during 1950-51 to study changes in Graduate School procedures, and have been reviewed in part by the Group Committees during 1951-52. They are presented now for further detailed study. It should be noted that they include what we believe to be necessary redefinitions of performance on the preliminary oral examinations, since the present Bulletin statements and the present Graduate School form are not consistent or clear on the concept of passing "with reservations."

Preliminary Examination--At least one full academic quarter before the degree is conferred, and only after the completion of the work in the minor field and the foreign language requirements or their substitutes, a preliminary oral examination of the student shall be given by a committee appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, upon recommendation of the appropriate Group Committee. The student's adviser will be the chairman of this examining committee. The committee shall ordinarily include the three members of the thesis review committee, plus at least two additional members. The Group Committees may recommend the appointment of different examiners for the preliminary oral examination and for the final oral examination if in their judgment such a recommendation seems appropriate. The Group Committees may also recommend the inclusion on both the preliminary and final oral examining committees of a member of the graduate faculty outside the major and minor fields of the student. Ordinarily the examining committees for both the preliminary and final oral examinations shall include a minimum of five members, three from the field of the major and two from the field of the minor, although the Group Committees may recommend the appointment of additional members if this seems desirable in given cases.

The preliminary oral examination shall cover the graduate work taken by the student and may include any work fundamental thereto, except the thesis and the special field reserved for the final oral examination. Only after passing the preliminary oral examination may the student be considered as a candidate for the Doctor's degree.

The outcome of the preliminary oral examination will be recorded in one of three possible ways. The candidate will pass the examination if four out of five members of his examining committee so vote. If the examining committee includes six or more members, a vote of two-thirds of the committee is necessary to pass the candidate. The candidate will fail the examination, if four out of five members of his examining committee so vote. If the examining committee includes six or more members, a vote of two-thirds of the committee is necessary to fail the candidate. If the above proportions of votes are not obtained, the

candidate will be reported as passing the examination with reservations. These reservations may involve: additional preparation and study followed by reexamination; the preparation of a special paper or written examination in a stated field or other special conditions deemed appropriate by the examining committee. The chairman of the examining committee will report the results of the preliminary oral examination to the Graduate School office, stating clearly, in the case of passing with reservations, what additional requirements must be met by the candidate prior to reexamination or prior to the reporting of satisfactory performance, and when such reexamination shall take place.

Students failing the preliminary oral examination may, upon recommendation of the examining committee, be excluded from further candidacy for the degree and in any case no reexamination shall be held until at least one full academic quarter has passed.

By unanimous vote of the examining committee at the time of the scheduled examination the preliminary examination may be waived whenever all individual members of the committee are satisfied that the candidate's overall record, including comprehensive preliminary written examinations, as presented by the major adviser, is sufficiently strong to warrant such waiver.

Preliminary oral examinations will not be scheduled during the period of final oral examinations for the June commencement—normally from about April 8 to May 6—or during the second term of Summer Session. Preliminary oral examinations must be scheduled in the office of the Graduate School by the candidate or his adviser one week in advance.

Final Oral Examination—After successful completion of final written examinations, when required, and of preliminary oral examinations, and after acceptance of the thesis by the thesis review committee, and not less than four weeks (for a June commencement, five weeks) before graduation, the final oral examination shall be given. This examination shall be conducted by a committee consisting of the major adviser, the two other members of the thesis review committee, and at least two additional members of the graduate faculty, appointed by the dean, upon recommendation of the appropriate Group Committee. This examination covers the thesis and the field of the candidate's special study and shall not exceed three hours. The final oral examination must be scheduled in the office of the Graduate School one week in advance.

The date of the final oral examination shall be publicly announced, and any member of the graduate faculty may attend. Upon completion of the examination, a formal vote of the committee shall be taken, and a unanimous affirmative vote of the members shall be necessary for recommendation of the candidate for the doctoral degree. The chairman of the examining committee will then report the result of the vote to the Graduate School office.

All Ph.D. candidates are required to register and pay tuition in

the quarter in which their final oral examination is taken.

Reports—Special blanks are provided for signed reports on the written examinations in the major, the preliminary oral examinations, the review of the thesis, and the final oral examination. All of these must be filed with the Graduate School office, and the thesis review and final oral report forms must be filed at least four weeks (for a June commencement, five weeks) before graduation.