

# SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, APRIL 28, 1960

3:30 P.M.

## MURPHY HALL AUDITORIUM

The membership of the Senate totals 161 including 122 elected members and 38 ex officio members (31 Administrative Committee and 8 Faculty Consultative Committee). For a quorum, a majority of the membership (81) must be present.

Faculty members entitled to vote for Senate members may be present at Senate meetings but shall not be entitled to vote or make motions. Such faculty may, at their request and with the approval of the Senate, be given the privilege to speak on matters under consideration in which they have an interest.

Members of standing committees who are not members of the Senate, including student members, may be present at a meeting of the Senate during such time as a report of their committee is under discussion and may participate in such discussion, but shall not have the privilege of making motions or of voting.

A special section will be provided for the seating of such faculty and such members of standing committees.

### ATTENDANCE RECORD

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

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

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

Year 1959-60

No. 5

## UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

### THE SENATE

### DOCKET

April 28, 1960

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

#### I. MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 1960

Reported for Action

#### II. SENATE COMMITTEES FOR 1959-60

Reported for Action

The President reports replacements as follows:

*Committee on Committees:* Clifford N. Wall to replace Leon M. Liddell.

*Committee on Student Affairs:* Janet S. Karon to replace Dianne McCleary, student.

#### III. NON-SENATE COMMITTEES AND BOARDS FOR 1959-60

Reported for Information

The President reports a replacement as follows:

*Conference Center Committee, All-University:* James A. Reese to replace Barry Graceman, student.

#### IV. FACULTY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

The Clerk of the Senate reports that Robert H. Beck and Sherwood O. Berg have been duly elected to the Faculty Consultative Committee for a term of 3 years (1960-63) beginning July 1, 1960.

#### V. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

1. Reported for Action

1. *United Fund Appeal.* There was a report from a special subcommittee appointed to consider feasibility of a single campus fund solicitation. In introducing this report, the President reminded the committee that a resolution, proposed but tabled, in the meeting of the Senate, March 10, 1960 (later circulated to the Senate membership), was in opposition to this report and that the Senate may properly review any action of the Administrative Committee.

Dean Morse, chairman of the subcommittee, gave the history and action of his group concerned with fund drives and reported extensive interest and many communications relevant to such on-campus drives. He referred to the President's letter of February 5, 1960, which transmitted recommendations of the subcommittee, as follows:

- That there be a single collection drive for University staff.
- That subscription to the drive by staff may be made through payroll deduction.
- That the University's basic allocation pattern will follow the community United Fund allocation pattern.
- That approximately 10 per cent of the total money collected be set aside as a discretionary fund to be allocated in accordance with the recommendations of a committee appointed for that purpose.

All the money in this discretionary fund must be expended during the calendar year for which the funds were collected.

The chairman said that there appeared to be minimum controversy over the proposal of a single collection drive for University staff or on staff support through optional payroll deduction. It was concerning the allocation pattern to be followed and the United Fund that discussion had arisen and his subcommittee had prepared an information sheet presenting arguments for and against independent and United Fund drives.

It was moved by Dean Morse, and seconded, that the proposal of the subcommittee be recommended to the Senate for action, subject to later review. In extensive discussion which followed, many issues were raised. Dean Howard emphasized the importance to the University of maintaining good relationships with a number of health agencies, some of which will not participate in a fund drive except with provision for the designation of gifts. The Committee recommendation would if followed, he thought, have the effect of reaching beyond our decision.

A number of variations of the plan were suggested, mostly with the purpose of providing for the designation of specific recipients of funds. It was proposed to amend the subcommittee recommendation (Item 4) to provide that in the single fund drive, means would be offered for indication of some non-United Fund agencies for which the donor might wish to designate a part of his contribution. Certain health organizations, heretofore excluded, would thus be admitted to the group receiving aid from campus solicitation. After motion duly made and seconded, this amendment lost by a vote of 14 to 7.

Some of the terminology of the report will need to be changed to take into account Ramsey County and the different campuses of the University, such as the St. Paul Campus. It was apparent that the opportunities for detailed allocation of funds through the business office are subject to equipment, budgetary, and personnel limitations. There was then the motion that the procedure proposed by the committee be modified to provide for a single pledge sheet on which allocation could be designated to the United Fund and to other approved agencies to benefit through collections made at the University. This amendment was defeated by a vote of 10 to 9.

A vote was then taken on the original motion recommending the proposal of the special subcommittee to the Senate for action. The count was 16 favorable votes and 4 opposed. Dean Howard requested that his vote be specifically recorded as unfavorable. The secretary was instructed to refer the recommendation to the Senate, making note of the proposed and defeated amendments to the plan of the special subcommittee, and reporting the vote count on the various actions.

2. Reported for Information

1. *Election of a Successor to President J. L. Morrill.* In the meeting of January 21, 1960, President Morrill commented with pleasure on the selection of Dr. O. Meredith Wilson to succeed in the presidency of the University and expressed his complete confidence in Dr. Wilson to provide the excellent leadership which the institution merits. He indicated a great satisfaction with the co-operation which had prevailed among the various interested groups, during the search for a new president. This should be a matter for favorable notice in the University, he said.

2. *Use of Multiple Academic Ranks.* It is sometimes asked if a faculty member at the University can simultaneously hold different academic ranks under multiple part-time appointments. For example, it might be desired to appoint a professor from one field of work as a part-time instructor or lecturer in another field, giving him the second appointment at a rank different from his normal rank. It was moved, seconded, and voted to approve the practice of not permitting a faculty member to hold appointments at two different University ranks. This was with the understanding that teaching assistants in one department, part-time, may concurrently hold appropriate part-time instructorships in other departments.

3. *Recommendation of Outstanding Achievement Awards.* The Committee on University Honors had proposed a number of Outstanding Achievement Awards and there was documentation pertaining to the nominees. It was voted to indicate approval of these awards to the Regents.

4. *Magna Cum Laude and Summa Cum Laude Honors at the Duluth Campus.* Provost Darland reported for information the decision of the Duluth faculty to grant *magna cum laude* and *summa cum laude* graduation honors. The requirements are generally similar to those applicable elsewhere in the University and the plan had been canvassed fully with offices concerned and reported to the President.

5. *Follow-up Inquiry of Former Students.* Failure of the University to realize its expected student attendance in the fall term of 1959, and again in winter quarter 1960, had created interest in follow-up studies of those students who left short of completion of their programs. Several of our colleges, the Office of Admissions and Records, and the Bureau of Institutional Research had planned follow-up studies. More recently, the need appeared for a more comprehensive and well co-ordinated work of this kind, perhaps to be managed centrally. The results would be valuable, for example, to the Minneapolis Campus Planning Committee. The President therefore discussed the plan and the procedure with the deans.

Decisions needed to be made concerning the nature of a generally acceptable questionnaire form, the manner in which respondents to the questionnaire might be identified, and the agency to circulate and receive the questionnaire materials. After looking at one version of a possible questionnaire introduced by the Bureau of Institutional Research, the committee heard discussion which indicated agreement on the pattern of questions to be asked. A suggestion was made that there would be value in conducting some follow-up interviews and that a special type of questionnaire might be devised for the inclusion of Graduate School students.

Various origins were suggested for the letter or general statement to accompany the question form, but it was finally voted to identify this material with the Bureau of Institutional Research. The name of the student will be entered on the questionnaire. There was support for a proposal that the Department of University Relations might prepare a suitable news release telling of the inquiry and that the results could be given out in general terms.

6. *Winter Quarter Enrollment Results.* In commenting on the end-of-second-week student attendance for the winter quarter, 1960, the President mentioned the attendance situation of the previous fall and the less-than-expected tuition income of this academic year. Aside from the problems of the moment, the University in preparing its 1961 legislative request will need (a) to present an analysis of why the forecast enrollments were not realized and (b) to take account of the enrollment situation in formulating its new maintenance and building request budgets. Questions were asked on the distribution of the students within the University and concerning the regional and national situation, in comparison to our own.

Dean Summers described the work under way for immediate review of forecasts of the job ahead for the University, and mentioned the related work being done by a subcommittee of the Minneapolis Campus Planning Committee. He said that a special working staff was being established and that this would receive the counsel of a widely representative board of faculty experts drawn from the fields which might be knowledgeable in the work. He invited the deans and their department heads to suggest additional people who should be included in the advisory group.

7. *Periodic Medical Examinations of Administrative Personnel.* The Regents had initiated a proposal that key administrative personnel of the University be offered periodic medical examinations, through the University Health Service, without cost to the individuals. A study of such health appraisal measures had been made among selected Twin Cities industrial organizations and with our insurance and health service representatives, and a report and proposal growing out of that study was placed before the Administrative Committee. It was emphasized that the type of examination contemplated would be far more comprehensive than the usual periodic physical examination. Two major policy questions were discussed: should such examinations be compulsory and, if so, to what extent; and should the results be transmitted in any form to the central administration of the University. The President asked for opinions.

Approval was indicated for examinations of this type, but there was concern regarding the fallibility of them. Moreover, any plan to report the individual results to the University administration, even subject to approval of the staff member concerned, might reduce the effectiveness of the examination. It was suggested that perhaps the Regents, when they made their suggestion, did not have in mind the choice which is necessarily made between obtaining optimal results or of sometimes accepting less valuable reports because of the presumed administrative uses of the examinations.

Administrative Committee opinion was almost evenly divided on whether the results of the examination should be privileged information or might be made available to the administration on request, although with the consent of the examinee. A vote on the proposal that the administration might request a health status evaluation (Item 4 of the suggested program) and obtain a report with the written consent of the individual, showed 10 to favor the specific provision and 12 opposed. The President said that he would report the discussion to the Regents.

R. E. SUMMERS, Secretary

(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the seating of the non-Senate members of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics for the discussion of the report of this committee.)

## VI. REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

### 1. Reported for Information

#### 1. Approved Schedules

##### TENNIS, 1960

March 22	Southern Illinois University—Tallahassee, Florida
March 23	Florida State University—Tallahassee, Florida
March 24	University of Georgia—Athens
March 25	University of Tennessee—Knoxville
April 4	University of Wichita
April 9	Carleton College
April 23	Minnesota Alumni
April 29-30	Michigan State University
	State University of Iowa
	Northwestern University
May 5	University of Wisconsin
May 6	University of Chicago—Chicago
May 13-14	Northwestern University—Evanston
	Purdue University—Evanston
	University of Michigan—Evanston
May 19-21	Conference championships—Evanston
June 20-25	N.C.A.A. championships—Seattle

##### GOLF, 1960

May 2	St. Thomas College
	Macalester College
May 7	State University of Iowa—Iowa City
	University of Wisconsin—Iowa City
	Indiana University—Iowa City
May 9	University of Wisconsin—Madison
	Northwestern University—Madison
	State University of Iowa—Madison
May 12	St. Thomas College—Keller Golf Course
	Macalester College—Keller Golf Course
May 20-21	Conference matches—East Lansing
June 19-25	N.C.A.A. matches—Colorado Springs

##### BASEBALL, 1960, JUNIOR VARSITY

Approval has been given for a baseball schedule for a Junior Varsity squad. Approval for Junior Varsity baseball is on a trial basis, for 1 year only; it is not intended to set precedent for approval of Junior Varsity schedules in other sports.

April 22	Macalester College—St. Paul
April 28	Macalester College
April 30	Concordia Junior College—St. Paul
May 6	Bethel College
May 7	Bethel College—St. Paul
May 14	Concordia Junior College—St. Paul
May 18	Hamline University—St. Paul
May 20	Concordia Junior College

#### 2. Actions of the Conference

At the meetings of March 3-5, 1960, the faculty representatives took the following actions on matters which had been submitted to this Senate for vote under the White Resolution procedure (Minutes of the Senate, February 4, 1960, pages 34-35).

a. The faculty representatives failed to reaffirm their previous vote through which each athletic director was given one vote in the Joint Group on all matters pertaining to regulations. Minnesota had not filed objection to the previous action.

b. The faculty representatives reaffirmed their previous action through which students transferring from a junior college or certain other institutions to a conference university can become eligible for competition and financial aid immediately upon entrance thereat. This action became effective March 3, 1960. Minnesota had not filed objection.

c. The faculty representatives failed, by a 5 to 5 vote, to adopt a motion which would have authorized the conference to negotiate a contract for continued participation in the Rose Bowl. Minnesota had filed objection against negotiation of a contract.

#### 2. Reported for Action

##### Participation in N.C.A.A. and Post-Season Events

Prior to amendments made March 4, 1960, Regulation II, Section 1 of the Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives provided that: "Post-season competition in all sports is prohibited. Seasons in all sports, unless otherwise limited in these Regulations, shall close with the N.C.A.A. championship meet in each sport. Nothing herein shall apply to the Rose Bowl game."

The faculty representatives, acting for the Joint Group, voted on March 4, 1960 two important changes in conference Regulation II, Section 1 which, under the White Resolution procedure, are now before the conference universities for consideration and possible objection.

1. *Concerning Participation in the Rose Bowl Game.* On motion by the Minnesota representative the faculty representatives voted 6 to 4 to delete the last sentence from Regulation II, Section 1 quoted above. This action prohibits participation by any conference member in the Rose Bowl. *Recommendation:* That the senate reaffirm its action of February 4, 1960, which instructed our faculty representative to vote in favor of rescinding the last sentence of Regulation II, Section 1.

2. *Concerning Participation in Championship Events of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (N.C.A.A.).* On recommendation of the athletic directors the faculty representatives voted to amend the second sentence of Regulation II, Section 1 as follows: "Seasons in all sports, unless otherwise limited in these Regulations and except for Olympic tryouts, shall close with the conference championship meet in each sport."

If this action is reaffirmed it will deprive teams and individual student-athletes from conference universities opportunities to compete in N.C.A.A. championship events which are usually held immediately following completion of the conference schedule. In some sports this action will eliminate some available dates for dual meets. The impact of this action on the development of a sound, strong and successful program of intercollegiate athletics would be profound.

The recommendation of the athletic directors which prompted the action referred to above appears to be based on their desire, following the negative vote on participation in the Rose Bowl, to obtain an expression of policy by the conference members concerning "in season" and "post-season" competition in general. The affirmative vote of the faculty representatives reflects their conviction that each conference institution should now declare its policy in this important matter.

The discussion which prompted the action referred to above and much comment which followed it failed to differentiate clearly between the objectives and sponsorship of N.C.A.A. championship events (which are in-season events as heretofore defined by Regulation II, Section 1) and post-season contests such as various bowl games. The former constitute a natural culmination of intercollegiate athletic competition under sponsorship by a collegiate association; the latter, in contrast, are exhibition contests, meaningless with respect to determination of collegiate championships, and not sponsored by a collegiate association.

Your committee has considered carefully the implications of the proposed change in Regulation II, Section 1, using as point of reference the statement of Policy on Intercollegiate Athletics which this Senate adopted unanimously on December 10, 1959 (Minutes, page 26). The following excerpts from this statement of policy are pertinent in this context:

"Deeply conscious of these tangible values the University will continue its policy of wholehearted support of a program of intercollegiate athletics, which, through excellence in all phases, will maintain the high standards which Minnesota teams have reached in the past."

"In scheduling intercollegiate competition the University is interested in a reasonable number of in-season contests, primarily with members of the Big Ten Conference and other associations to which it belongs, or which adhere to similar standards of athletic conduct and policy."

The athletic director and all head coaches of the University are unanimous in their view that prohibition against N.C.A.A. competition would seriously weaken the program of intercollegiate athletics at Minnesota. Your committee shares this view. It regards N.C.A.A. championship events as coming within the regular season of competition as it has been defined in Regulation II, Section 1 for many years. It supports the principle that participation in such events by qualified teams and individual student-athletes is a logical and desirable part of an intercollegiate athletic program. Past experience has shown that participation of our student-athletes in the championship events which are now sponsored by the N.C.A.A. is feasible without serious interference with the students' academic obligations, and without depreciation of competition within the conference.

Other members of the conference have already filed objection against the change in Regulation II, Section 1. It will therefore be voted on again in May 1960. Your committee has voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate

- a. That our faculty representative be instructed to vote against the proposed change and for continued participation of the conference in the N.C.A.A. championship events which are now established.
- b. That our teams or individual athletes be permitted to participate in these events, if qualified.

M. O. SCHULTZE, Chairman

*(There will be a pause in the proceedings to permit the withdrawal of non-Senate committee members.)*

VII. NEW BUSINESS  
VIII. NECROLOGY  
AUGUST B. SALMELA  
1914-1959

August B Salmela, Assistant Professor of Animal Husbandry at the University of Minnesota's North Central School and Experiment Station at Grand Rapids, died on December 10, 1959, in Duluth, Minnesota.

Salmela was born on a farm in St. Louis County near Embarrass, Minnesota, on January 7, 1914. He grew up in Northeastern Minnesota, attending public schools there, later graduating from the North Central School of Agriculture at Grand Rapids and from the College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics of the University of Minnesota. He also received his Master of Science and Doctor of Philosophy degrees from the University of Minnesota.

He began his career with the University as a research assistant, later becoming an instructor and on July 1, 1959 was promoted to the rank of Assistant Professor. Always interested in the development of good livestock, he directed his attention to the dairy cattle improvement at the North Central Experiment Station. His primary research, however, centered on the development of economically produced meat type hogs. It was while carrying out a segment of that research in Duluth that he was stricken with a heart attack and passed away.

He was an enthusiastic teacher and many students throughout Northern Minnesota will remember him not only for his subject matter but also for his deep personal interest in them.

Salmela served in the United States Army during World War II. In 1949 he visited Brazil for the International Basin Economy Corporation. He worked for a private swine breeding establishment in Indiana just prior to his first full time appointment at the University.

He is survived by his wife Viola and three children, Julie, Linda, and Bruce, who live in Grand Rapids, Minnesota.

WILFRED OAKLEY STOUT, JR.  
1909-1960

Wilfred Oakley Stout, Jr., associate professor of social studies in the General College, died after a long illness on Thursday, February 18, 1960, in St. Paul.

Professor Stout was born in St. Paul on October 24, 1909. He attended St. Paul Academy, and earned the B.A. and M.A. degree in history at Princeton University, where he graduated with honors, won the Joline Prize for senior thesis in American history, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. After teaching for a year at Princeton, and later working for the Minnesota Institute of Governmental Research, Professor Stout became a member of the Department of History at the University of Chattanooga. He joined the faculty of the General College in 1943 as an instructor in social studies.

In the General College, Professor Stout taught courses in American and European history, and in Far Eastern affairs. He devoted most of his attention, however, to the field of Minnesota history, and made a special study of railroads and politics in this state during the Progressive movement at the turn of the century. Several years ago, his course in Minnesota history was broadcast over station KUOM. Tape recordings of his lectures on key issues and and figures in United States history, a series televised in 1959, were requested for use by the United States Department of State.

In addition to his work on campus, Professor Stout was a member of several professional associations. He was an alumni trustee of St. Paul Academy, and a board member and officer of the St. Paul Academy Alumni Association. He served in various capacities on the board of the University Y.M.C.A., and was a member of Unity Church in St. Paul.

The breadth of Professor Stout's knowledge, the clarity of his presentation, his sparkling wit, and the fact that he thoroughly enjoyed teaching were all reflected in his crowded classrooms. He was endeared to his University associates by his quiet humor, his unfailing good nature, his unassuming modesty, and his willing co-operation with efforts directed toward the welfare of the college and the University.

Professor Stout is survived by his wife, daughters Penelope and Douglass, and son Richard, all of St. Paul.

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

DOCKET SUPPLEMENT - APRIL 28, 1960

I. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE  
Reported for Information

1. Proposed Budget Plan for 1960-61. The President said that although customarily he has discussed the Proposed Budget Plan with the Faculty Consultative Committee and the Administrative Committee prior to taking it to the Regents, this time he gave the prospectus to the Regents on April 8 explaining that he had not had an opportunity to review it with these committees. The Regents approved the plan with authorization to the President to amend and revise it if deemed advisable after consultation with the committees. The President reported having reviewed the prospectus with the Faculty Consultative Committee on April 13 obtaining their endorsement.

He then discussed the situation generally, reviewed some of the problems of budgeting during recent years and commented that many of these problems still exist. He stressed that we are still seriously affected by not having realized the enrollments that were predicted in good faith and that the situation had been accentuated further because in no quarter has the enrollment been above a year ago. Mention was made that enrollments are being restudied by a faculty committee to determine where the losses occurred and why.

The comment was made that the Proposed Budget Plan is based on an assumed Fall Quarter 1960 enrollment of 27,150 students. Enrollment for Fall 1959 was 26,538. The proposal is essentially a status quo budget except for academic salary increases amounting to about six per cent of the academic payroll. Last year there was 8 per cent for this purpose making a total of 14 per cent for the biennium. Again no funds are available for general distribution for new positions and no increases are provided for supplies, expense, and equipment.

Vice President Lunden distributed copies of the Budget Plan which was then discussed in detail. There was extensive presentation of the distribution of salary increase money, the proposed changes in the salary floors, the problem of supplies expense and equipment and other related matters.

Following extensive discussion of problems inherent in the proposed budget, the committee voted unanimous approval of the plan amended to provide the following rates for Teaching and Research Assistants and Administrative Fellows:

B (9 months - 100% Time) \$4230 (\$470 per month)

A (12 months - 100% Time) \$5640 (\$470 per month)

The President then said that, in view of the authority given him by the Regents, he will proceed to send instructions to the deans on this basis and will report to the Regents the reasons for doing so.

2. Faculty Retirement Plan. Attention was directed to a Comparison of Average Salaries and Fringe Benefits for the faculty at Minnesota with those at other institutions in the Big Ten. It was pointed out that during the past ten years these institutions and others have initiated major increases in the final retirement allowances so that even with the addition of Social Security benefits in 1955 the University of Minnesota has fallen behind these institutions in faculty retirement provisions.

The report presented and discussed by Vice President Lunden and Director Archer indicated the need for improvement in the following areas of our Faculty Retirement Plan:

1. Our competitive position in total retirement allowances has approached a danger point in recruitment and retention of academic staff.
2. The funded portion of our final retirement allowance is not high enough.
3. Our present plan of only one unit of retirement annuity each year accelerates too slowly; the annual premium contributions from the staff member and the University are too small in the early years of an individual's participation which loses the advantage of additional premiums paid in the early years and deprives us of interest accumulations on larger amounts for longer periods of time.

The following changes in our Faculty Retirement Plan are offered as a method of correcting the above deficiencies insofar as we are able at this time.

Retirement income shall be provided from The Basic Plan and from Social Security. The Basic Plan shall provide the following:

One unit of retirement annuity shall be offered each of the first three years of participation and three units per year thereafter until (1) the staff member has accepted sufficient units to provide his maximum retirement allowance; or (2) until he has received the maximum thirty units offered one individual; or (3) until the University premium contribution reaches:

- \$750 per year for Professors and Associate Professors
- \$650 per year for Assistant Professors and Instructors

The total retirement allowance including the total individual income from Social Security shall be subject to the following maxima:

		Present
Professors	\$5,500	(\$4,603)
Associate Professors	5,000	( 4,253)
Assistant Professors	4,500	( 3,903)
Instructors	4,500	( 3,903)

The Retirement Plan described above shall provide income

- a. Not less than the income from the annuities from the Basic Plan plus income from Social Security.
- b. Not more than 50 per cent of average salary for the last five years preceding retirement, or not more than one-sixtieth of such average salary times years of University full-time service, whichever is the lesser.
- c. From the University Supplement, an amount subject to the limits of "b" above.
- d. Not less than the amount provided by the formula on Page 20 of the September 1959 "Outline of Insurance and Retirement Plans for Members of the Faculty".
- e. For Earlier Optional Retirees, the above maximum retirement allowances shall be reduced by \$167 for each year earlier than their compulsory retirement dates.

It was explained that we have no resources to accomplish this except an accumulation of dividends on insurance that might finance it for about three years. Continuance of the plan beyond that period would require legislative appropriation. Doing anything about it at the moment would be a calculated risk. The proposal bears the endorsement of the University Committee on Group Insurance and Retirement and has been accepted by the Board of Regents.

The Administrative Committee voted cordially to endorse the recommendations.

T. E. Pettenfill, Secretary Pro Tem

## II. LOYALTY OATH Reported for information

The Board of Regents at its meeting on April 8, 1960 voted agreement with the position taken by the University Senate on the Loyalty Oath and Disclaimer-affidavit provision of the National Defense Education Act.

L. R. Lunden, Secretary

## III. NEW BUSINESS Reported for Action

Professor Paul R. O'Connor submits the following proposal:

RESOLVED that the question of whether the University of Minnesota should this fall establish University classes at the Robbinsdale Senior High School be referred to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate for recommendation for Senate action.