

5M
L65

SENATE MEETING

THURSDAY, MAY 27, 1971

3:30 P.M.

NICHOLSON AUDITORIUM

The voting membership of the University Senate totals 188 including the President, 126 members of the faculty, and 61 students. For a quorum, a majority of the voting membership (95) must be present. Amendments to the Constitution require advance publication and 126 affirmative votes. Amendments to the Bylaws require advance publication and 95 affirmative votes. Other actions require a simple majority of the members present and voting. The members of the all-University Administrative Committee are ex officio nonvoting members of the University Senate.

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

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

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

ATTENDANCE RECORD

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

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

Year 1970-71

No. 4

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

THE SENATE

DOCKET

MAY 27, 1971

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

I. MINUTES FOR MARCH 11, 1971 Reported for Action

II. SENATE AND UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES, 1971-72 Reported for Action

Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations: James Prues (chairman), Paul Berrisford, Paul Cashman (ex officio), Stan Kegler (ex officio), Ernest Kemble, Leslie King, Roger Page, Samuel Popper, Barbara Redman, Ruth Richards, Robert Sonkowsky, Keith Wharton; (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Social Policy: Elving Anderson (chairman), Ernest Coleman, George Donohue, Warren Ibele, Stan Kegler (ex officio), Craig Kissock, Barbara Knudson, Fred Lukermann, (ex officio), Frank Wood: (3 alumni members to be appointed) (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on University Honors: William Lockhart (chairman), Joyce Funke, Edwin Haislet (ex officio), Richard Jordan, William McDonald, William McEwen, James Scoggins, Duane Scribner (ex officio), William Shepherd (ex officio): Alumni: John Pillsbury, John Moorhead, Oscar Knutson, Curtis Carlson, Harry Heltzer: (3 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Printing and Publications: Ralph Hopp, (chairman), Sherwood Berg, Walter Brovold, C. Luverne Carlson (ex officio), John Fisher (ex officio), Richard Mather, Malcolm Myers, Louis Safer, Duane Scribner (ex officio), Harold Swanson (ex officio), Robert Taylor (ex officio): (3 students to be appointed)

University Schedule Committee: Landis Boyd (chairman), Thomas Chamberlin, John Fisher (ex officio), Raymond Lammers, Lloyd Lofquist (ex officio), Glenn Reed, Dorothy Sheldon, John Webb: (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Business and Rules: Frank Sorauf ((chairman), Donald Beatty (ex officio), Thomas Boman, John Cound, Eleanor Fenton, David Kieft, Enid Schoettle, Ted Underwood: (4 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Educational Development: William Gardner (chairman), George Blake, Wendell Glick, LaVell Henderson, Warren Ibele, Lloyd Lofquist (ex officio), Robert Sonkowsky, William Spring: (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Extension and Community Programs: Richard Skok (chairman), Roland Abraham (ex officio), David Darby, James Holte, J. Clark Laundergan, Fred Lukermann (ex officio), John Mauriel, Thomas Scott, Richard Swalin, Richard Weatherman, George Williams, Howard Williams: (1 ex officio from General Extension Division to be appointed) (1 ex officio from alumnus to be appointed) (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Computing Facilities: Hugo John (chairman), Eugene Ackerman, Gordon Davis, John Gergen, Audrey Grosch, James Henderson, Russell Hobbie, Ellen Pirro, William Shepherd (ex officio), Frank Verbrugge (ex officio) (4 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media: Eugene Wright (chairman), Marilyn Backlund, Russell Burris, Kenneth MacCorquodale, Roger Moe (ex officio), Harold Opgrand, Burton Paulu (ex officio), Willard Philipson (ex officio), Carl Poppe, Cletus Schertx, James Wertz (ex officio): (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on Summer Sessions: David Vose (chairman), Paul Cartwright, Adele Donchenko, Roxanna Ford, Arnold Henjum, Gordon Kingsley, Fred Lukermann (ex officio), Magnus Olson, Willard Thompson (ex officio): (5 students to be appointed)

University College Governing Council: Norman Kerr (chairman), Wilbert Ahern, Clark Chambers, David Cooperman, Robert Falk, Richard Hey, Fred Lukermann (ex officio), Carolyn Rose, Frank Sorauf, Warren Stenberg, Frank Wilderson: (1 additional ex officio to be named) (5 students to be appointed)

University Committee on University-ROTC Relationships: LaVell Henderson (chairman), Frederick Adelman (ex officio), William Beard (ex officio), Walter

Broughton (ex officio), Ernest Coleman, Dorothy Loeffler, Lloyd Lofquist (ex officio), Howard Morris, Fred Morrison, John Ness, Robert Reese (ex officio), Robert Scott: (4 students to be appointed)

Senate Library Committee: Gerhard Weiss (chairman), Kent Bales, Russell Burris, Russell Dubois, Albert Frenkel, Howard Hanson, Ralph Hopp (ex officio), Dale Lange, Wayland Noland, Peter Roll, William Rosendahl, Lloyd Smith, Leonard Wilson: (8 students to be appointed)

Senate Committee on Research: Robert Wirt (chairman), Hale Champion (ex officio), Bryce Crawford (ex officio), William Flanigan, Stephen Hedman, Robert Holloway, William Hueg (ex officio), Stan Kegler (ex officio), James Lawver (ex officio), Kenneth MacCorquodale, Robert Mulhausen, Alfred Nier, L.E. Scriven, William Shepherd (ex officio), Conrad Weiser: (3 students to be appointed)

III. ASSEMBLY AND CAMPUS COMMITTEES, 1971-72

Reported for Action

Campus Committee on Business and Rules: Frank Sorauf (chairman), Donald Beatty (ex officio), John Cound, Eleanor Fenton, David Kieft, Enid Schoettle: (2 students to be appointed)

Campus Committee on Placement Services: Margaret Grindereng (chairwoman), Max Alvord, Ralph Miller, Martin Snoke (ex officio), Anne Truax, David Weiss, Arnold Woestehoff: (3 students to be appointed)

Campus Committee on Convocation and the Arts: Roy Schuessler (chairman), Kenneth Graham, Henry Hansen, Norton Hintz, Ross Smith (ex officio), Barbara Stuhler, Arnold Walker: (3 students to be appointed)

Assembly Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics: Jerome Moss (chairman), Donald Beatty, Hale Champion (ex officio), George Donohue, David Giese, Theda Hagenah, Eloise Jaeger, Edward Leete, Merle Loken, Marshall Ryman (ex officio), Max Schultze (ex officio), Stanley Wenberg (ex officio): 3 students to be appointed

Campus Committee on Intramural and Extramural Activities: Vera Schletzer (chairwoman), Kenneth Graham (ex officio), Glen Gullickson, Jay Meiske, Pat Mueller (ex officio), Ed Siggelkow (ex officio), Mary Wyvell: (5 students to be appointed)

Campus Foreign Student Committee: Selmer Engene (chairman), Donald Cowan (ex officio), Charles Fairhurst, Warren Ibele (ex officio), James Kingsley, Forrest Moore (ex officio), Takashi Okagaki, James Preus (ex officio), Ruth Roberts, Joseph Schwartzberg: (5 students to be appointed)

IV. REPORT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE ON THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET

1. Reported for Information

2. Items Reported for Information

Honors Committee report. Mr. Lockhart presented 4 nominations for the Outstanding Achievement Award which were approved by common consent.

Guidelines for offers to appointments to academic staff. Mr. Shepherd reviewed a proposed form letter to be used in the appointment procedure. It would be written by the dean of the college and would provide for the signature of the appointee indicating his concurrence.

Nepotism policy. Mr. Shepherd reviewed a proposed change in the nepotism policy, which is also being submitted to the Faculty Affairs and Civil Service Committees, and the Task Forces on the Status of Women, and which would require Regents' action. The policy would remove restrictions on hiring persons related through affinity or by marriage but would not permit a person so related to participate in decisions to hire, retain, promote or determine the salary of the other person or to be assigned supervisory responsibility for his-her work. The motion to recommend the change to the Regents was approved.

Cap and Gown Day Convocation. Mrs. Godfrey reported that a committee appointed by the President had recommended that the Cap and Gown Day Convocation be suspended on the Twin Cities campus and that individual colleges or University organizations could hold their own special honors program. It was moved that the Administrative Committee make a positive statement that better recognition of honors would be by the individual college, and the motion was approved.

Changes in the course credit module and bulletin copy. Mr. Shepherd will issue a memo urging that changes in the credit module for courses must be made known as soon as possible so that decisions on printing can be made.

Equal Employment Opportunity handbook. Mr. Smith reported that deans and department heads had received a copy of the EEO handbook on policies and programs. Programs cover employment opportunity in the broad sense, including civil service employment, recruitment and training, educational programs, and community outreach programs. It is urgent that all departments submit their academic and civil service goals for employment of minorities, so an accurate picture for the University can be completed by fall. Mr. Eidenberg urged support for the Public Service Careers Program, which is a new important component of the University's affirmative action program. The recruiting mechanism has been set up; there will be reimbursed training; and it is important to examine departments for opportunities to place these applicants.

Policy on use of University mails and duplicating facilities. Mr. Smith presented the report of the Administrative subcommittee on use of campus mail and University duplicating facilities and asked that department chairmen be urged to discuss it with their faculties.

Cost development model. Two booklets, "A Description of the Minnesota Cost Development Model" and "A Student Demand Matrix," prepared by the Graduate School Research Center, were distributed. The cost development model would serve as a planning tool and would facilitate cost planning resulting from curricular changes. Mr. Crawford will get out a report series to call faculty attention to the model.

MARILEE WARD
Secretary

V. ELECTION OF THE VICE CHAIRMAN

Reported for Action

The Constitution of the University Senate stipulates that a vice chairman shall be elected by the Senate at its first meeting in the spring of the academic year from among its members for a term of one (1) year. He shall be eligible for re-election.

W. DONALD BEATTY
Clerk

VI. SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING & RELATIONS SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Review of the Grading System

When the Senate approved the use of P-N grading, the following section was included in the recommendation that was approved:

7. The effects of authorization of use of the P-N grading on educational practice at the University shall be reviewed by the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing (now replaced by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations) and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy not later than the academic year 1970-71, and a recommendation brought to the Senate by these groups for continuation of this authorization for use of P-N, or for discontinuance, or for such other modifications in Senate legislation on grading as may seem advisable.

Senate Minutes, March 9, 1967, p. 75...

In accordance with the provision, a subcommittee was established. The subcommittee has developed a preliminary report which is being presented for information at this time and will be presented for action at some future meeting after there has been sufficient consultation and discussion throughout the University.

1. Reported for Action—Continuation of P-N Grading

The subcommittee found widespread support for continuing P-N grading in some form and has dealt with it in its report. As an interim measure the committee recommends that the present P-N grading system, including the various exceptions and modifications that have been approved by the Senate Committee on Student Scholastic Standing and the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations, be extended for one year. It is also recommended that the permission to extend the deadline for changing from A-F to P-N and vice versa to the end of the second week of the quarter be granted to all colleges.

2. Reported for Information

This report has been received and briefly discussed by both committees. No action has been taken in either committee regarding formal approval.

Report of Preliminary Recommendations by Student Scholastic Standing Subcommittee

This report of preliminary recommendations is conveyed for the purpose of keeping the Senate and the University informed on the direction and progress of the subcommittee on Student Scholastic Standing and hopefully to stimulate discussion among the entire University community.

The charge given to the subcommittee was to review the effects of the use of P-N grading on educational practice at the University and to bring a recommendation to the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations and to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy for continuation or for discontinuation of the P-N option, or for such other modifications on grading as may seem advisable. At its initial meeting on December 17, 1970, the subcommittee determined that it should review the P-N grading option within the context of the total University grading system and thus in essence review the grading practices of the University as a whole. The following recommendations resulted:

Recommendation 1: (See Reported for Action) Because the subcommittee viewed this assignment as an opportunity to possibly effect total University thinking about evaluation, it was felt that broad circulation, consultation, discussion and argument by the University community would be essential. Therefore, we recommend that the present P-N grading system (including the various exceptions and modifications that have been granted by the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations and including the modification that the deadline for changing from A-F to P-N be two weeks from the beginning of each quarter for all colleges) be extended for a period of one year so that time for total University participation on any major grading revision would be available. We are suggesting that the Senate be informed on the issues of evaluation with which we are dealing at the spring meeting, and that action on these issues be taken after departments, collegiate units and other groups have discussed the matter fully. Perhaps Senate action could be taken at a special meeting called during the fall quarter.

Recommendation 2: The subcommittee acknowledges that at this time society demands that the University serve a certification role as well as an educational role. As certifier the University is called upon to verify competence. The subcommittee although tempted to reject this external-directed function as it does little to improve learning and teaching (and in fact, may well interfere), came to the conclusion that for a large public university to break radically with "the system" may well handicap our graduates in their applications to graduate schools, professional schools, and prospective employers against the applications of graduates of other institutions.

However, in its certifying role, the University is not compelled to certify "failure." The subcommittee, therefore, feels that symbols which convey the meaning of "failure" have an unnecessarily negative impact and are punitive. We recommend the discontinuance of the symbol "F" for this reason.

Recommendation 3: Since the "transcript" is used as the University's certificate of performance, and since the institution has an obligation to identify students who seem to be making little use of their opportunities, and therefore, have not earned the right to claim the valuable, but limited resources of the institution, the subcommittee recommends that the official University transcript be a complete, chronological record of the courses for which a student has officially registered and the grades received. (This is a recommendation against a "pass-no record" proposal.)

Recommendation 4: The grading symbols and their definitions as recommended by the subcommittee are as follows:

A—indicates successful completion of course at a superior performance level.

B—indicates successful completion of course at a performance level significantly above the accepted standard.

C—indicates successful completion of course at an acceptable performance level.

D—indicates successful completion of course at a performance level that is below the accepted performance level. This grade is used only to indicate performance sufficient to fulfill graduation requirements but usually unacceptable as preparation for further study.

N—indicates that no credit is to be awarded. The symbol is intended to be given totally without prejudice and implies nothing other than that the student registered for the course but did not complete the work of the course. This grade may be given to students who attempted all the course work but did not perform satisfactorily; it also will be given to students who withdrew at any time during the quarter. The grade is permanent, but in the case of students who will later complete the work of the course, may be changed through mutual agreement of the instructor and the student. (This grade replaces the current "F," "I" and "W" and as such must be viewed as indicating only that the student did not complete the work of the course.)

V—a registration symbol indicating registration as a visitor or auditor of the course.

X—a symbol which may be reported by an instructor on continuation courses indicating that the student is permitted to continue but the grade cannot be determined until the sequence is completed. The instructor shall submit a grade for each X when the student has completed the entire sequence.

W—a registration symbol indicating that the student has officially withdrawn from the University. This symbol can only be posted by the University recorder.

S—indicates a satisfactory grade where the qualitative discrimination in the A, B, C, D system is not desired or is not possible.

Further Interpretation and Application of the Preliminary Proposed Grading System:

1. The subcommittee has combined the functions of the current "F," "I" and "W" into one category—"N" with the expectation that it would be difficult, in fact dangerous, for anyone to equate "N" with "failure." Hopefully, "N" would communicate only that a student registered for a course but did not complete the work of the course.

2. The "S" symbol carries a broad definition that covers its use as "S" in the current S-U system as well as its use as the satisfactory symbol in the current P-N

system.

The reason the subcommittee recommends changing the "P" symbolism is that as it now exists, the "P" has been associated with the A-F scale. The subcommittee feels there should be a two-scale system that is completely divorced from the A, B, C, D system so that there is an alternative grading system that will truly free faculty to view student work in a different way and to evaluate it differently. Instructors should be free to determine for a given course and in some cases even for a given student what satisfactory means. This freedom is not possible if it is tied to the traditional scale.

For those departments and colleges that want to have a three-scale system (O-S-N, where "O" indicates superior performance) the subcommittee suggests that they petition the Senate Committee on Academic Standing and Relations for permission. The rationale of the subcommittee for recommending O-S-N rather than A-S-N if a three-point scale is to be used, is that the subcommittee wishes to avoid mixing the S-N system into the GPA award structure, and if "A" were used in both, this would not be possible.

3. The subcommittee recognizes that it has not yet wrestled with some important questions. For example, the subcommittee has not as yet grappled with what restrictions should be placed on the "S" grade? Should S-N courses be available to students without restriction? Another question—is the two-week time limitation currently placed on the choice of a grading system the right limit or should it be extended through the sixth or eighth week of the quarter?

In summary, the subcommittee recommends two grading systems for the University: 1) a five-point scale, A-B-C-D-N, that is comparable with the traditional A-F scale except for the change in interpretation of "N"; 2) a two-point scale, S-N, that replaces the O-S-U and the P-N systems.

The subcommittee will continue its deliberations both in terms of dealing with issues that have not been covered and to hear reactions from individuals and units. We are aware that there is not complete agreement even within the subcommittee on some issues.

We would reiterate the purpose of this preliminary proposal—to generate discussion among all elements of the University community. We anticipate widespread discussion within the University. For example, we will be scheduling a meeting with the chairmen of the curriculum and scholastic committees of the respective colleges and will be receptive to joint meetings with such committees. We also suggest that a series of open hearings be held prior to formulation of the final report to the Senate.

Members of the Subcommittee on Student Scholastic Standing are as follows:

Leslie King, Chairman	Owen Halleen
Richard Anderson	Charles Liesenfelt
John Buchanan	Manley Olson (ex officio)
Ted Campbell	Samuel Popper
Paul Cartwright	David Vesall
Millard Gieske	Keith Wharton
Jack Goodding	Ruth Richards
Stephen Granger	Lynn Joesting

JEANNE LUPTON, CHAIRWOMAN
Senate Committee on Academic Standing & Relations
MAY BRODBECK, CHAIRWOMAN
Senate Committee on Educational Policy

VII. REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY AFFAIRS

1. Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs has carefully considered and adopted as its own the recommendations of the Subcommittee on Equal Opportunities for Faculty and Student Women. The Committee moves acceptance of the following:

Recommended Guidelines FACULTY WOMEN

1. Each department should recruit women at least to the point where the proportion in the department is roughly equal to the average proportion of women obtaining the requisite advanced degree in the discipline in the last five years. (Data on the number and per cent of women Ph.D.'s, by field, from American universities is available from the annual Summary Report: Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities, National Research Council.)

HIRING

In implementing this guideline the following steps are recommended:

- Women should be appointed to all personnel and recruitment committees.
- Such committees shall be charged to consider qualified women equally with men.
- Open positions should be advertised nationally.
- Whenever two or more candidates for a position are approximately equally well qualified, preference should be granted to the appointment which will help meet University equal opportunity goals.
- In judging qualifications, the evaluators should look beyond formal credentials, which may themselves reflect the effects of past discrimination, and attempt to form judgments of probable overall promise—judgments of a candidate's abilities to contribute to the University's primary missions.

PROMOTION AND TENURE

- Specifically defined criteria for promotion and tenure shall be applied uniformly without discrimination as to sex.
- Departmental committees that make recommendations on tenure and promotion should include at least one woman if there is a woman qualified by rank and tenure to serve.
- Criteria for deciding promotion and salary increases of department chairmen, higher level administrators, and other faculty in decision-making positions should be enlarged to include their contribution to the attainment of University equal opportunity goals.

GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES

- Effective grievance procedures that accommodate complaints of discrimination on the basis of sex shall be provided and widely publicized.
- Grievance committees which concern themselves with the grievance of a woman faculty member should include at least one woman member.

WOMEN IN ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

- The University should appoint, when openings occur or are created, several women to key line administrative positions at both the central and collegiate levels.
- Provision should be made for developmental opportunities; e.g., appointments should be made to low level posts which allow individuals to acquire the appropriate knowledge and skills for promotion to high level posts.

- All Search Committees shall be charged with the responsibility for considering qualified women for all administrative positions.

SALARIES

- Academic units should take immediate action to provide comparability in salaries of men and women faculty members, using available funds. Further, since academic units with preponderant women faculty have, over a long period, been penalized with respect to salaries, it is recommended that central and collegiate administrations make specific allocations to these units in order to improve this situation.

NEPOTISM

- The proposed new statement of policy concerning nepotism contained in Vice President Shepherd's memorandum of April 5, 1971 should be adopted with the following bracketed deletion and the substitution of immediate for supervisory in the final sentence:

"The University of Minnesota acts in accord with public policy to encourage and foster, to the fullest extent practicable, the employment of properly qualified persons regardless of their age, race, creed, color, handicap, sex or national origin or ancestry.

In selecting persons for employment, no restriction is placed on hiring persons related through affinity or consanguinity. However, to avoid possible conflict of interest which could result from peer judgment, supervision or administrative review procedures, a person so related must not participate (either formally or informally) in decisions to hire, retain, promote or determine the salary of the other person, and must not be assigned supervisory responsibility for work of the other person."

SANCTIONS

- If a unit of the University persistently fails to correct existing inequities in regard to women or ethnic minorities and is unable to demonstrate that the reasons for its failure are beyond its control, all of its personnel decisions should become subject to college-level or central administration review until such time as the unit appears capable of eliminating discrimination by itself. The decision first to impose administrative review and thereafter to end it should be vested in the Senate Judicial Committee acting upon a recommendation of or an appeal from a lower-level grievance committee, as provided in the proposed revision of the tenure regulations, or upon request of the University's EEO officer or by any officer duly designated to oversee compliance with University policy regarding equal employment opportunity.

STUDENT WOMEN

This document has dealt essentially with faculty problems; similar guidelines will be drawn up for the protection of women students from discrimination as to sex and marital status.

2. Reported for Information

In addition to special recommendations to the Senate regarding "Equal Opportunities for Faculty and Student Women," the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs will distribute a special report of its 1970-71 activities at the May 27th meeting. This "Report to the Faculty," assuming that the Senate does not object, will subsequently be distributed to the entire faculty by campus mail.

E. SCOTT MAYNES
Chairman

VIII. REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (Task Force on Secrecy in Research)

Reported for Action

The Senate Committee on Research has approved and joins with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy in recommending that the University Senate endorse and accept the report of the Task Force on Secrecy in Research as follows:

The Board of Regents at its meeting on July 10, 1969 approved Articles 1 and 6 of the Senate Policy on Secrecy in Research. Thereafter, at the request of the Regents, the Task Force on Secrecy in Research was appointed by President Moos in consultation with the Senate Committee on Research and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy to study the consequential effect of application of Articles 2 through 5 of the Senate Policy on Secrecy in Research on the current operations of the University.

A progress report from the Task Force on Secrecy in Research was reported for information to the University Senate at its meeting on March 12, 1970. This report indicated that if Articles 2 through 5 were literally interpreted in their application approximately two-thirds of all University contracts and grants would be subject to a complex review procedure. This concern arose from the contract and grant publications language which often restricts release of research results prior to agency review and approval of manuscripts. After an exhaustive study of contracts and grants currently in force at the University it became clear that agency review procedures are not intended as a mechanism for the triggering of classification of research results. The University expressed its desire to the Council on Federal Relations of the American Association of Universities to have restrictive clauses removed from contracts and grants. They in turn made representations to Dr. Lee A. DuBridge the then Director of the Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President. We were advised that all departments and agencies which belong to the Federal Council for Science and Technology had approved the following resolution in 1967:

Language restricting the publication or other dissemination of information resulting from work done under a research contract with an academic institution should be made a part of the contract only in those cases in which the agency feels that the restriction is needed and intends to enforce it. In those cases, the agency shall assure that the responsible academic institution official is fully aware before consummation of the contract that information resulting from the work can be released only under certain conditions. The institution should obtain whatever concurrence of the scientific participants it deems appropriate.

Notwithstanding this resolution a number of bureaus and departments within the Federal government have not taken steps to modify boilerplate publications clauses in their contract and grant instruments.

Following are Articles 2 through 5 of the Policy on Secrecy in Research as approved by the Senate. Following those are the proposed interpretations of that language as recommended by the Task Force on Secrecy in Research, the Senate Committee on Research and the Senate Committee on Educational Policy:

ARTICLE 2: The University of Minnesota shall not accept support from any source for research under a contract or a grant, even though it meets the requirements of Article 1, if the contract or grant limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results or specifically permits retroactive classification, except for reasons found compelling by the University community through the review process outlined in Article 4.

Proposed Interpretations for Article 2:

This article should be interpreted to safeguard free and open inquiry and discussion by faculty, students and others. It should not be interpreted to prevent acceptance of

support from sponsors whose regulations proscribe publication of research results prior to agency review and approval, where such review and approval is based on scientific concerns not related to political or security considerations. The Task Force is satisfied that agency review procedures which are contained in current agreements are not intended as a mechanism for triggering classification of research results. In the course of our exhaustive study, there were no cases revealed in which such an instance has occurred at this University in recent years. During the course of, or following the completion of an investigation, should a sponsor attempt to limit full and prompt dissemination of results by withholding approval to release findings, for other than reasons of scientific merit, all contracts with that agency should be reevaluated in accordance with Article 4.

ARTICLE 3: The above policy shall apply to any research under a contract or grant which does not limit the full and prompt public dissemination of results at the time the research is undertaken by the University but becomes so limited thereafter. As soon as this occurs, the contract or grant, the disposition of the results of the research obtained under such contract or grant, shall be re-evaluated under the provisions of Article 4.

Proposed Interpretations for Article 3:

We recommend the same interpretations for Article 3 as for Article 2. Proposed interpretations for Article 4 are included in the brackets.

ARTICLE 4: (a) The Director, Research Contract Coordination, or some other designated University official, shall report to the Senate Research Committee every proposed research grant or contract which meets the requirements of Article 1 but limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results (as interpreted under Article 2). If this officer is not certain whether a particular research proposal requires the Senate Research Committee's recommendation, he shall submit the proposal to this committee for its determination.

(b) The Senate Research Committee shall recommend to the Senate acceptance or rejection of every proposed contract or grant which limits the full and prompt public dissemination of results (as interpreted under Article 2) during fall, winter and spring quarters, in sufficient detail to permit informed discussion of the recommendations made. In addition, the Committee shall report on any problems encountered in implementing this Policy.

In performing its functions hereunder, the Senate Research Committee shall be authorized to seek the advice and assistance of ad hoc subcommittees competent to pass on the particular matters that may be involved. If some other University committee also has jurisdiction in a particular case, nothing in this Statement of Policy shall deprive it of that jurisdiction.

(c) The University Senate shall review the recommendations of the Senate Research Committee and forward its own recommendation to the President. All proposals which are to be submitted for Senate evaluation shall be accessible to members of the University community (the faculty and students) in sufficient detail to permit informed evaluation and discussion.

ARTICLE 5: The University shall not make available any of its facilities for which permission is required to any individual, group, or organization for research which violates this Statement of Policy. Exceptions may be made through the review procedure outlined in Article 4.

Proposed Interpretations for Article 5:

As with Article 2 this article should be interpreted to safeguard free and open inquiry and discussion by faculty, students and others. It should not be interpreted to deny users of University facilities when their work on campus is consistent with the proposed interpretation of Articles 2 and 3. University staff responsible for facilities should provide individuals or groups with the Statement of Policy at the time use agreements are arranged. They should also learn enough about the nature of the proposed research so that a responsible judgement can be made about the appropriateness of the University sharing its facilities for the work. A disclaimer would say that the user understands the policy and that his use is consistent with it.

L. E. SCRIVEN
Chairman, Senate
Committee on Research

C. M. STOWE
Chairman, Task Force
on Secrecy in Research

VIII. REPORT OF UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

1. REPORTED FOR ACTION

RECOMMENDED CHANGES IN PROVISIONS REGARDING THE PROCEDURE FOR APPEAL CONTAINED IN THE UNIVERSITY SENATE STATEMENT ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY

Delete the first sentence under **University Appeals Procedure** and insert the following instead:

If the Collegiate Appeals Committee has made a recommendation on the case to the dean, director, or provost which differs from the decision of the department, any party still dissatisfied may file an appeal with the President's Office.

If the decision of the department favors the complaining party and the recommendation of the Collegiate Appeals Committee is in accord with that decision, the party complained against may file an appeal with the President's Office. If the decision of the department favors the party complained against and the recommendation of the Collegiate Appeals Committee is in accord with that decision, the complaining party may take no further appeal.

If there is no appropriate Collegiate Appeals Committee to hear cases arising from a particular academic unit, appeals from the Grievance Committee of that academic unit may be taken directly to the University Appeals Committee.

The remainder of the paragraph under **University Appeals Procedure** will remain unchanged.

Purpose of changes. The purpose of these changes is to prevent undue harassment of individuals who may be complained against. If the decision of both the department and collegiate levels is in their favor, it is reasonable to end the matter there. On the other hand, persons complained against should be able, in fairness, to exhaust the appellate procedure provided.

2. REPORTED FOR INFORMATION

a. On April 20, 1971, the Consultative Committee sent the letter set forth below to President Moos.

April 20, 1971

Dear President Moos:

At the meeting of the University Senate on March 11, 1971, a student Senator introduced a resolution (a copy of which is enclosed) "That the University Senate support the principle of students serving as members of the Board of Regents." As Chairman of the Senate, you referred the resolution to the Senate Committee on Business and Rules which, in turn, referred it to the Senate Consultative Committee to determine whether the subject matter of the resolution is germane to the purposes of the University Senate.

The Consultative Committee has decided that the subject matter of the resolution is germane to the purposes of the Senate because it deals with the government of the University. However, the Consultative Committee also concluded that the Senate will best be prepared to consider this issue only in a broader context. The proposed resolution raises basic questions as to (1) what should be the duties of the Board of Regents; (2) what should be the appropriate relations between the Board of Regents and other sectors of the University community; (3) whether it is necessary, in order to bring about these relations, that the Board membership include representatives of these various sectors—students, faculty, civil service personnel and administrative personnel, and (4) how the members of the Board of Regents should be chosen.

Because the functions and composition of the Board of Regents are in question and the issues can be resolved only by the State Legislature and, in view of certain proposals that have been made, possibly only by amendment of the Minnesota Constitution, the Consultative Committee thinks that the Board of Regents itself is the best body to undertake the inquiry and recommends that it do so. At the least, the results of such an inquiry can lead to improved communication between the Board of Regents and the other sectors of the University community—a desirable objective in itself.

The Consultative Committee urges that you convey this recommendation to the Board of Regents on its behalf. If the Regents should think it advisable to constitute a faculty-student committee to help in making the recommended study, I am sure that the faculty and student body will be eager to cooperate. The Consultative Committee will be glad to meet with you and the Regents to discuss this recommendation, if you and the Regents think such a meeting may be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

Carl A. Auerbach, Chairman
University Senate Consultative Committee

"FOR STUDENTS SERVING AS REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA"

"In dozens of colleges and universities throughout the U.S., students have been elected or appointed to serve as voting members of the boards of trustees which govern their institutions. For example, the Massachusetts State Legislature has passed a law giving students voting membership on state college and university governing boards. There will be one student on each of the state's five governing boards to be elected by students. The reasons behind this movement are compelling.

"The Minnesota Legislature has implied that students should pay a substantial part of their educational costs through higher educational appropriations that fall short of the costs of administering programs. The Higher Education Coordinating Commission has been more specific in its recommendations to the 1971 Legislature:

"In order that costs may be shared appropriately between the student and the state, the Commission recommends that the policy of the state on tuition rates in state collegiate institutions be to expect that income from tuition provide approximately 30 per cent of instructional costs as represented by direct and indirect expenditures for instruction and departmental research."

"The present policy of the University's Board of Regents is that students in the University system should pay 28.7 per cent of their educational costs through tuition.

"Whatever the precise figure is, students do pay a substantial share of their educational costs. However, at the ultimate level of University policy formation where decisions are made on how state and student funds are spent for student education, students are not represented.

"This point suggests another compelling reason why students should serve on the Board of Regents. When state subsidies to higher educational systems are viewed as investments in the manpower resource of future state economic, cultural, and individual welfare, it follows reasonably that those who must live longest with the consequences and benefits of the decisions of the Board of Regents—youth—should hold a substantial share of the responsibility in the decisions made by the Board. Most youth see the world differently than do their elders, and clearly their stake in the future is greater than those they will outlive.

"Youth is not now represented in the University Board of Regents. Although the median age in Minnesota is 27.6 years (1967), the youngest Regent is 46 years old, and the oldest is 73. The average of the twelve is 58.7 years. Based on an assumed life expectancy of 70 years, the generation of students now at the University will outlive the present board by an average of almost 40 years. This age gap ought to be reduced by the 1971 Legislature.

"Minnesotans have recently demonstrated increased confidence in youth through significant expansion of higher educational opportunity, by electing the youngest governor in the U.S., and by lowering the voting age to include most of the college age youth of Minnesota.

"Resolved: That the University Senate support the principle of students serving as members of the Board of Regents."

b. At the meeting of the University Senate on March 11, 1971, a Student Senator introduced the following resolution:

"Many of the corporations of this nation are headed by Board of Director's who have become self-generating and have not always acted in the best interest of their stockholders and society. This has resulted at least in part from a policy of the stockholders failing to vote their stocks. This University, due to its investments in many of these corporations, is in an excellent position to influence the policies of those corporations to act in the best public interest.

"I. Be it resolved that the All University Senate request that the Board of Regents delegate to the All University Senate the authority to select representatives to cast the Universities shares at the corporations' annual meetings on all matters submitted to a vote of the stockholders.

"II. And be it resolved that the All University Senate request that the Board of Regents delegate to the All University Senate authority to determine how the votes to which the University is entitled due to its stockholdings shall be cast."

As chairman of the Senate, President Moos referred the resolution to the Senate Committee on Business and Rules which, in turn, referred it to the Senate Consultative Committee to determine whether the subject matter of the resolution is germane to the purposes of the University Senate.

The Consultative Committee has decided that the subject matter of the resolution is not germane to the purposes of the Senate because the issues raised are "non-academic" within the meaning of the University Senate Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

CARL A. AUERBACH
Chairman

X. REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED INTERFERENCE WITH THE ORDERLY PROCEDURES OF THE SENATE

Reported for Action

This Senate Ad Hoc Committee was formed to investigate the actions of Colonel Frederick J. Adelman, U.S.A.F., Professor of Aerospace Studies at the University of Minnesota, in relation to reported statements made before a Senate Committee by Jerome F. Winzig, a graduate student in English. Mr. Winzig was, at this time, a recently commissioned Second Lieutenant in the Air Force Reserve. This Ad Hoc Committee submits the following findings and recommendations:

On May 21, 1970, Lt. Jerome F. Winzig was summoned to Colonel Adelman's office as the result of statements critical of the Air Force R.O.T.C. program made by Lt. Winzig before the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and reported in the *Minnesota Daily*. This interview was witnessed by Lt. Colonel James W. Nordmeyer, U.S.A.F., and Captain Thomas J. Flanagan, U.S.A.F., respectively Professor and Assistant Professor of Aerospace Studies at the College of St. Thomas. Colonel Adelman, making it clear that he was attempting to be helpful to a new inexperienced Second Lieutenant, took critical note of Winzig's statement before the Educational Policy Committee. The facts are disputed, but we believe that Colonel Adelman suggested to Lt. Winzig that should he make further such statements, and in so doing identify himself as a Reserve Officer, he would run the risk of future military disciplinary action including court-martial. Again, the facts are disputed, but it is clear that Colonel Adelman either read verbatim, or stated to Lt. Winzig the substance of Articles 31, 134 and 135 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. (Article 31 is intended to inform a potential subject of court-martial of his rights. Articles 134 and 135 set forth substantive grounds for the imposition of sanctions pursuant to court-martial jurisdiction). It is undisputed that Colonel Adelman informed Lt. Winzig that he would not forward information of this event to higher command but would keep an open file for a year, after which it would be destroyed, but would forward such information in the event similar action occurred in the future.

Prior to interviewing Lt. Winzig, Colonel Adelman contacted Air Force Officers at Maxwell Air Force Base for advice as to how to deal with such situations, and for information validating his view of the limits of permissible dissent and criticism by members of the military. He received on 15 June 1970 a letter dated 3 June 1970 from the Commander of Air Reserve Personnel for dissemination to all Professors of Aerospace Studies, and dealing with the subject of discipline of officers on

educational delay status. That letter read, in pertinent part:

While freedom of speech is an inherent right of American citizens, it does not allow citizens who are also members of the military the right to engage in defamatory or subversive actions against the United States or its military service. Officers on educational delay who engage in such actions are subject to action specified in AFR 35-62. ROTC staff and faculty personnel are advised to refer all derogatory matters relevant to officers on educational delay to DPAAS, Hq ARPC, Denver, Colorado for appropriate command action. Reserve officers on educational delay as a follow-on of the ROTC program are under command jurisdiction of Hq, Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC), Denver, Colorado. Academic and scholastic monitoring falls within the purview of AFIT, Wright Patterson AFB, Ohio.

That letter was interpreted by Colonel Adelman as confirming the correctness and validity of the discharge of his military obligations as he saw them in this case.

This committee, after an independent review of the situation, finds no evidence that Colonel Adelman intended to restrict or interfere with the orderly procedures of the Senate as a result of the action here reviewed. On the other hand, the committee does not agree with Colonel Adelman's feeling that his allusion to potential future court-martial carried with it no threat or coercion. Certainly Lt. Winzig interpreted Col. Adelman's actions and statements as constituting such a threat and was loathe to testify later as a result. The action of Colonel Adelman in introducing, if not the body, at least the sense of Article 31 (although Colonel Adelman claims this was superfluous at the time) had the impact of conveying a strong suggestion that future activity of the kind Lt. Winzig had engaged in could well bring punitive action by the military. In light of the foregoing, the committee feels that the atmosphere created as a result of the interview, and the publicity which followed have the potential of a chilling effect on the candor of Reserve Officers on educational delay status, who are students, and ROTC students when and if they testify before Senate Committees conducting their legitimate business.

This committee, in probing the episode and its implications found a number of perplexing factors. It is clear that Colonel Adelman's communication with Lt. Winzig was authorized (Air Force Regulation 45-40, Section A, Paragraph 2,b) and proper for Colonel Adelman as Senior Air Force Officer at the University of Minnesota. However, this committee judges the nature of Colonel Adelman's communication with Winzig inappropriate for a university professor. While Colonel Adelman may very well have believed that his actions, rather than referral of the situation to his own higher military authority, would result in a less punitive conclusion, he was apparently unaware of the relationship of this incident to the responsibilities of his professorial role. Other assumptions regarding that role are equally perplexing. Colonel Adelman believes strongly, and argues vigorously that he would not have taken this action, that indeed this action would not have been warranted, had Lt. Winzig not identified himself publicly as a Reserve Officer. Colonel Adelman's position raises a complex and difficult question. His confidence that the lines for such procedures can easily be drawn by him or anyone else is not shared by all members of this committee. In addition, it seems to us that the statement in the Air Force regulations on which he relies for such in interpretation, and the letter from the Commander of Air Force Personnel, convey no discretionary authority. Even if it were easy to draw the line, there is a further difficulty. It is clear that Colonel Adelman viewed himself as under obligations to carry out orders from above in his command — orders which he clearly conceived of as requiring him when a conflict of interest arose between his responsibilities as a military officer and his responsibilities as a faculty member, to regard the former as his paramount obligation. Thus clearly the Colonel and the institution were caught, and continue to be caught in a difficult and contradictory situation since conduct appropriate to the fulfillment of military obligations, described by Colonel Adelman, can very well conflict directly with conduct appropriate for a Professor in the University of Minnesota.

In Summary the committee concludes:

1. That the immediate episode did not interfere with the orderly procedures of the Senate;
2. That Colonel Adelman acted in his capacity as an officer, not as a teacher. His relationship to Lt. Winzig was not professorial and the then Lieutenant on inactive status was not in any way a student in the ROTC program;
3. That although he later reported his actions to academic representatives, Colonel Adelman neither dissociated himself from his professorial role nor consulted academic authorities for guidance. He sees his academic title as a nominal one, due to a highly limited contractual relationship with the University. This view raises perplexing and disturbing questions;
4. That it is clear that Colonel Adelman's claim of his responsibility to monitor public statements extends only to individuals identified as Air Force officers, who are also students, not to the body of ROTC trainees, however identified;
5. That while the atmosphere of the interview was in our judgement — and probably inadvertently — more coercive than necessary, the coerciveness seems inherent in a policy that Air Force officers, who are students, need to be monitored.

This committee thus recommends that the Senate, through an appropriate standing committee, address itself to the question of determining the proper relationship of military officers, assigned as instructors in the R.O.T.C. program, to the University and to the Senate.

Lastly, our investigations revealed another matter of some concern which impinges upon the matter at hand. Colonel Adelman stated that because of summary treatment by a Committee of the Minnesota Chapter of the A.A.U.P. he was denied due process. The A.A.U.P. Executive Committee censured Colonel Adelman without asking him to appear before it and relied on an interview conducted by one member of the Committee with Colonel Adelman (1). A copy of the censure report was sent to Vice-President Shepherd. The content thereof was somehow released to the press by persons not identified. Colonel Adelman contends that because of the procedure followed by A.A.U.P. he was effectively prevented from presenting his side of the case before the report and its contents were made known. In our view, informal procedures, such as those followed by A.A.U.P. in this case, do not provide adequate protections for persons who are the subject of A.A.U.P. investigations. We thus take this occasion respectfully to request that the A.A.U.P. Executive Committee review and establish clear policies for procedures it will follow in this kind of case in the future.

WALLACE D. ARMSTRONG
HAROLD CHASE
SAMUEL KRISLOV
WILLIAM S. HOWELL
DONALD G. MARSHALL
PAUL L. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN

(1) Local A.A.U.P. officials have informed this committee that A.A.U.P. does not normally hold formal hearings as part of either its national or local investigatory process. Rather, it makes its own investigation of complaints involving academic freedom, and, if it substantiates a complaint, makes recommendations to the administration based on its finding of fact.

XI. RESPONSE TO SENATE RESOLUTION

The Regents have received the resolution of the University Senate of March 11, 1971. The Regents acted in the McConnell case in the light of their best judgment concerning their responsibilities. The Regents are confident they were acting fully within established principles and rules of the University and will continue to do so. They recognized that their action might be challenged in court, as it was, and that court action would clarify at least some of the issues they faced. They do not believe that the appeal was unwarranted, and indeed believe that using the appeal process will strengthen and clarify understanding of the relationship to law of their decision in the

McConnell case. Further comment during the pendency of the appeal does not appear appropriate.

This response has been reviewed by members of the Board and is being transmitted with their concurrence.

LESTER A. MALKERSON
Chairman, Board of Regents

XII. REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC STANDING & RELATIONS

Reported for Information

This being the last scheduled meeting of the year, the following items of committee discussion and activities are reported for information:

1. Review of the grading system (See joint report of the Senate Committees on Academic Standing and Relations and on Educational Policy)
2. Experimental grading practices approved

In accordance with Section 19 of the University Senate Action of March 9, 1967, which provided for Senate Committee approval of experimental plans for grading, this committee has reviewed several proposals. The following were approved and details were reported in the Senate Minutes, March 11, 1971:

- a. S-U grading in the College of Education
- b. Extension of the deadline for changing from P-N to A-F or vice versa
- c. Use of O-S-U symbols in the College of Veterinary Medicine
- d. Experimental use of symbol "W" by the Institute of Technology for winter quarter, 1971, only

3. Institutional relationships

During the past year subcommittees have been dealing with relations with prospective students, relations with other post-secondary institutions, and internal communications. The committee has supported several conferences and meetings involving faculty and administrators from other institutions.

4. Accreditation of nonpublic secondary schools

Under the terms of the Revised Criteria (Senate Minutes, December 4, 1969, pp. 9-29) two nonpublic secondary schools were revisited: St. Thomas Academy, St. Paul (which was reviewed jointly with the North Central Association) and St. Francis High School, Little Falls. Both were recommended for continued accreditation by the University of Minnesota subject to submission of annual reports which satisfy the Criteria.

JEANNE T. LUPTON
Chairman

XIII. REPORT OF SENATE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

1. Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has submitted the following letter to President Moos:

"We write to offer our cooperation on the issues raised in your memoranda of May 5 and 10, 1971 regarding Emergency Planning for the 1971-72 budget.

"We are saddened and dismayed by the decisions of the House Appropriations Committee and the Senate Finance Committee which precipitated your memoranda. But we are anxious to assist in the establishment of procedures to implement the readjustments which will be required should the Legislature confirm the decisions, as presently formulated, of its committees.

"We are certain that the entire University Community would agree that the success of the University in meeting its responsibilities depends on the wise allocation of whatever resources are available to it according to priorities which are widely understood and generally accepted. To this end, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy offers its assistance in recommending priorities which might best maintain the integrity of our educational programs and permit essential educational development to continue.

"We are confident that other University Senate Committees, such as the Committee on Resources and Planning and the Committee on Faculty Affairs, would also be willing to undertake consideration of relevant priorities and, with your encouragement, we would begin discussions with such groups and with the office of the Vice President for Academic Administration.

"Please understand this letter to convey our appreciation and support of the prompt administrative efforts in response to the developing budget limitations and be assured of our desire to cooperate in these efforts at assuring the best interests of the total educational mission of the University."

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy solicits any recommendations from faculty and students which may contribute to meeting the present crisis in the most educationally responsible manner.

2. Report to the Senate for information

Excellence in teaching at the University of Minnesota has long been encouraged and rewarded. In an attempt to continue and advance that tradition, the Senate Committee on Educational Policy placed on its agenda the question of the use of various evaluative techniques. The committee studies this question not only to determine present usage, but also to determine whether the University is organized to help faculty improve and evaluate their teaching.

In order to know current policy and practice with regard to such matters, SCEP surveyed through a questionnaire all instructional units of the University. In that questionnaire and in its discussions, SCEP has been careful to make the question of teacher evaluation a two-part one. On the one hand, personal information about teaching effectiveness can be gathered through student evaluation forms, visits by colleagues, attempts at self-evaluation. On the other hand, the information so gathered can be shared with one's departmental officers for purposes of determining salary, promotion, retention.

Of the 124 instructional units, some 95 provided information on their evaluation procedures, faculty attitudes thereto, and the uses made of course evaluation results. 59 per cent (40 per cent) (See note) of the instructional units use some evaluative device, and, although the question was not asked, this figure indicates an increased use of such tools over even a few years ago. Furthermore, the results of the questionnaire show that 57 per cent (39 per cent) of the faculty (insofar as the survey mirrors individual faculty attitudes rather than group response) have a positive attitude toward the use of evaluative techniques in their classes.

Since course evaluation is only one measure of the effectiveness of instruction, we asked units to report on the use of any other means for improving instruction. 42 per cent (29 per cent) of the units responding use additional means, with particular emphasis being placed on the use of audio-visual aids and the televising of lectures for purposes of critical review by the instructor and colleagues. However, only 25 per cent (17 per cent) of the units reported any "formal means to assist faculty in the development of their teaching." More centralized facilities or staff for this kind of assistance at the division or college level would help supply such means.

The questionnaire contained a series of questions centering on the use of evaluative data beyond the point of the instructor involved. 26 per cent (18 per cent) of the units had a policy in this regard and 8 per cent (6 per cent) of the units distribute bases of comparison for the unit as a whole, against which an individual faculty member measures his own performance. 45 per cent (31 per cent) of the reporting units encourage faculty to submit the results of course evaluation and other evaluative information to the department, but there is no estimate of how frequently this is done or of precisely what use the presence or absence of such information is in merit and

promotion considerations.

Because SCEP believes that regular evaluation of teaching can contribute to the improvement of instruction at the University of Minnesota, we took up this question, make the above report to the Senate, and have initiated procedures with the deans, directors, and division heads for conducting a year's study of the question of teaching evaluation. During the academic year 1971-72, colleges and divisions will conduct a series of seminars with wide participation among the faculty. SCEP further assumes responsibility for planning and coordinating these seminars. The committee sees this move as a constructive attempt to stimulate discussion and disseminate information about a matter of great concern to all members of the faculty. These seminars will have as their general theme "Toward Better Teaching."

(Note: First percentage is based on number of units reporting; percentage in parentheses is based on total numbers of units which could report.)

3. Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Educational Policy has surveyed Deans and Provosts to collect numerical data on the course credit module conversion. The following table indicates the present pattern (before) and the pattern which will be implemented fall quarter 1971 (after). Figures do not include 8-000 level courses, variable credit courses, and courses with credits to be arranged.

SUMMARY OF COURSE CREDIT MODULE CONVERSION FALL, 1971

School		No. of Courses	No. of Credits	Per cent		
				5-6 Credits	4 Credits	3 or less
College of Agriculture	Before	286	888	8	15	77
	After	266	959	17	47	36
College of Biological Sciences	Before	121	420	23	20	57
	After	129	496	34	30	36
College of Education	Before	716	1811	4	1	95
	After	696	1857	5	10	85
College of Forestry	Before	41	122	7	10	83
	After	44	146	11	37	52
General College	Before	121	473	45	6	49
	After	120	484	49	8	43
Home Economics	Before	105	322	5	5	90
	After	106	344	13	6	81
College of Liberal Arts	Before	2785	8951	10	9	81
	After	2301	9495	30	59	11
College of Nursing	Before	10	51	60	30	10
	After	11	62	82	18	0
U of M - Duluth	Before	1424	4159	7	5	88
	After	1317	4226	10	27	63
U of M - Morris	Before	549	1764	30	4	66
	After	528	1981	47	23	30

School of Business Administration Minimal changes to date. Most courses will remain on a 2 credit basis. Currently considering major changes in curriculum structure that will require wholesale course changes. "To make such course changes now would be premature."

Institute of Technology Almost all undergraduate courses will be 4 or 5 cr starting 71. Dept cr totals after conversion smaller than before, 1 or 2 except.

College of Pharmacy Of a total of 122 cr, 64 (53 per cent) are either 4 or 5 cr or a mixture of 2 & 3 cr courses. Many of the remaining 3 cr courses represent 2 lecture and lab sessions a week. "We do not feel an urgent need to restructure our curriculum but rather will seek to bring about a change toward 4 & 5 cr modules in the normal course of curriculum revision."

U of M - Crookston "We have and will continue to evaluate our curriculum on the possibility that some subject area is adaptable in the 4-5 cr Module Concept. However, the present feeling of the Academic Administrative Committee is that technical education will be difficult to adjust to this form of course structuring. We formally request to be exempt from any major change or changes in our course structuring philosophy."

U of M - Waseca Request to maintain flexible credit system.

MAE BRODBECK
Chairman

XIV. REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE

ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN INVESTIGATION

Reported for Information

The University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Investigation has met on several occasions. The report of the previous committee (1969-70) chaired by Dr. Ivan Frantz has been studied and abandoned. The committee has accepted testimony from interested faculty through the winter quarter. Based upon the accumulated information, the committee is now in the process of developing a policy document to serve the needs of the University. When it is completed, hopefully before the end of the academic year, it will be distributed widely to obtain the reaction of the faculty. It is anticipated that a new document will be ready for Senate action before the end of this calendar year.

LAWRENCE C. WEAVER
Chairman

XV. REPORT OF THE TWIN CITIES STUDENT ASSEMBLY

Reported for Information

The student members of the Twin Cities Campus to the Consultative Committee for the year 1971-72 are: Al Badiner, Janice DeGross, Peter Hames, Thomas Strapp, and

David Truax.

ELI ROSENFELD,
Chairman

XVI. ANNUAL REPORT OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON BUSINESS AND RULES

Reported for information

During the year the committee attended to the following business: Letter to chairmen of Senate and University committees about committee procedures and obligations; obtaining addresses of student committee members; review of Senate meeting times and frequency; review of UMD constitution on behalf of the Senate; voting status of Senate vice-chairman on the Consultative Committee (no change recommended); time of election of Senate vice-chairman (recommended to Consultative Committee change to fall meeting); voting arrangements for faculty members of the Library (deferred until next year); survey of and procedures document about Senate elections; change in period during which student Senate elections may be conducted (by-law change approved by Senate); division of Health Sciences and Institute of Agriculture into separate units for voting for senators (by-law changes approved by Senate); recommendation to President of the Senate that marshals be appointed for Senate meetings; consideration of Civil Service staff participation in the Senate (recommendation of University-wide task force, including Civil Service members, for broad survey of Civil Service governance before review of Senate participation); brief statement of qualifications on ballot for Consultative Committee candidates; conduct of Consultative Committee elections on each campus rather than through Senate Clerk (by-law change approved by Senate); procedures for maximizing attendance at Senate and University committee meetings (under study); details of accreditation process for press coverage of Senate meetings (under study); chairmanship of the Senate (under study).

ROGER B. PAGE
Chairman

XVII. ANNUAL REPORT OF UNIVERSITY SENATE CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

1. Professor John G. Darley, retiring Chairman of the Consultative Committee, appointed a special Committee on Academic Responsibility. Created on July 16, 1970, the Committee worked through the Summer and Fall and, in cooperation with the Consultative Committee, produced a Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility which the Consultative Committee presented to the Senate during the Fall quarter. The Senate debated and modified the Statement in some respects and approved it as modified on December 17, 1970.

The Consultative Committee presented to the Senate on May 27, 1971, certain amendments to the provisions regarding the procedure for appeal contained in the Statement on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

2. At the request of the Consultative Committee, a proposed increase in parking rates on the Twin Cities Campus was held in abeyance until the matter could be examined by the Senate Committee on Faculty Affairs and the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning and reported on to the Twin Cities Assembly. These Committees are still grappling with the parking problem; they concurred in the increase that was put into effect about the first of the year.

3. The Consultative Committee met with the President and Vice Presidents early in the year to discuss the principles that should guide the University's request for legislative appropriations and the problems of tuition increases associated therewith.

4. The Consultative Committee directed its Chairman and Professor Reynolds to discuss with Central Administration the possibility of using funds from the Educational Development Fund to institute periodic qualitative reviews of all major educational and research programs of the University. These discussions took place and the proposal is under consideration. The discussion also dealt with Professor Reynolds' suggestion that the possibility of changes in the University calendar be examined in order to improve educational programs and economize in the use of limited resources.

5. The Consultative Committee met with the Vice President for Administration to review the report of Professor Neely Gardner dealing with non-academic personnel policy.

6. A resolution introduced at the Senate meeting on March 11, 1971, called for Senate support of the principle that students should serve as members of the Board of Regents. This resolution was referred to the Consultative Committee via the Committee on Business and Rules. The Consultative Committee has written to President Moos recommending that the Board of Regents undertake to study anew (1) what should be the duties of the Board of Regents; (2) what should be the appropriate relations between the Board of Regents and other sectors of the University community; (3) whether it is necessary, on order to bring about these relations, that the Board membership include representatives of these various sectors — students, faculty, civil service personnel and administrative personnel; and (4) how the members of the Board of Regents should be chosen. The Committee offered the cooperation of faculty and students in the making of such a study.

7. The Consultative Committee has acted on a number of matters also affecting the Committee on Business and Rules on which the latter Committee will report to the Senate.

8. The Consultative Committee met with faculties and administrators in Duluth and Morris to become better acquainted with, and help find ways to solve, the problems faced by these coordinate campuses.

9. The Consultative Committee has been constantly concerned with the problem of communication within the University and between the University and the state as a whole. It welcomed the institution of BRIEF as an improvement in communication within the University. It remains concerned about the inadequacy of communication between the Senate and the Regents and between the University as a whole and the state at large.

It is alarmed by the erosion of popular support for the University and will give this matter close attention during the coming academic year.

CARL A. AJERBACH
Chairman

XVIII. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Reported for Information

This Committee met at least once each quarter during the academic year 1970-71.

XVIII. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EXTENSION AND COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Reported for Information

This Committee met at least once each quarter during the academic year 1970-71. Impeded often by a lack of quorum, the Committee finally "reported for information" to the Senate Committee on Educational Policy a policy statement on continuing education as an integral part of the educational units of the University of Minnesota and the need for improved consideration and coordination of these activities by the University. Support for establishment of an Administrative Coordinating (Planning) Council was included in this statement with encouragement for such a Council to report regularly to UCECP for planning review inputs. This report was rejected by the Senate.

The recommendation for a change in the name of the Agricultural Extension Service of the University to that of Cooperative Extension Service was studied and "reported for action". Subsequently, the Senate approved this change and it is presently awaiting action by the Board of Regents.

The Committee has followed the Federal revenue sharing proposals and Congressional modifications which have import for the Agricultural Extension Service programs of the University. Policy consequences of these proposals are potentially significant.

The need still exists to find effective and acceptable means to achieve greater coordination of the University's complex of activities in the extension and community program area. This Committee for the balance of this academic year and, if necessary, in the beginning of the next year will continue to seek viable solutions towards this end.

RICHARD A. SKOK
Acting Chairman

XIX. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CAMPUS COMMITTEE ON HONORS PROGRAMS

Reported for Information

Due to the chairman's preoccupation with too many other committees, only one meeting of this committee was called during the academic year. The lack of any demand for meetings by other members of the committee encourages him to suppose that no really urgent business has been neglected, but the responsibility for not turning the group into that powerhouse of intellectual stimulation that a committee should be lies wholly at the chairman's door. At the sole meeting a progress report on the efforts of the Institute of Technology to organize its honors program was received. Professor Burnham Terrell's service as Director of the CLA Honors Program has been marked by a steady growth in the vitality and importance of that program and both college and university owe him a considerable debt of gratitude for his labors. He has been succeeded by Professor Frank D. Hirschbach, under whose direction yet further progress will no doubt be made.

RUTHERFORD ARIS
Chairman

XX. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND MEDIA

Reported for Information

The University Committee on Instructional Materials and Media has been involved in several projects during the past academic year. At the request of the Office of the Vice President, Academic Affairs, the Committee participated in evaluating the proposals made in response to the Instructional Equipment Grant Program. At the present time the Committee is preparing a critique of the program in the event that other special legislative appropriations might be made for this purpose at some time in the future. The Committee also initiated contact with Physical Planning and Development regarding the equipping of general purpose classrooms for the use of the new instructional media. Several members of the Committee have participated in the all-University Educational Resources Study now in progress. At the present time the Committee is seeking ways to encourage the use of a portion of the Educational Development Funds for the Development of instructional materials. Hopefully this effort will result in a handbook or brochure summarizing available sources of technical and financial support for the development and use of new instructional equipment and materials. Hopefully a broader response to the Committee's charge will be possible during the next academic year.

EUGENES S. WRIGHT
Chairman

XXI. ANNUAL REPORT OF SENATE JUDICIAL COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

At the time of its last annual report the Senate Judicial Committee had just completed a hearing in a case. Findings were later submitted to the President, and the case was settled in accordance with them. Since then five members of the faculty have filed requests for hearings. Of these one was withdrawn after reconsideration and reversal of a departmental decision against reappointment of a probationary member of the faculty. Action in another case has been postponed to await the result of inquiry by an outside reviewing committee appointed at the suggestion of the Vice President (Academic Administration).

Two cases have passed through the hearing stage. In the first of these, findings were submitted to the President which supported the propriety of the grounds assigned by the department and the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the grounds for non-reappointment of a probationary member of the faculty. In the second case, the Committee is now formulating its findings. This case is novel as a challenge by the complainant, an instructor on non-regular appointment, to the constitutionality of the classification of faculty appointments as regular and non-regular, at least when the non-regular appointment results from continuing status as a graduate student in the University. It has been argued by the complainant that such a non-regular member of the faculty is entitled to the same procedural safeguards in deciding upon and notifying him of non-reappointment, and to the same standards in assessing the propriety of grounds for non-reappointment, as in the case of regular probationary appointees.

Another complaint, which apparently will go forward to a hearing, and which involves non-reappointment of a probationary member of the faculty, is now in the stage of gathering documentation.

In addition to the five requests for hearings a preliminary inquiry has been made by another probationary member of the faculty who has not yet decided whether to request a hearing. Documentation concerning his situation is being collected. A member of the faculty holding indefinite tenure has consulted the Chairman of the

Committee with respect to a duty assignment offered upon terms which might have impaired rights of tenure. This matter has been satisfactorily adjusted.

The members of the Judicial Committee feel some concern that the substantial increase in requests for hearings, which contrasts sharply with an absence of any hearings during the preceding decade or more, may create a situation in which the painstaking and time-consuming procedures followed by the Committee cannot be continued. In cases in which one or both parties are usually represented by attorneys, a circumspect and carefully documented procedure is a price which must be paid to avoid lawsuits, but it will be difficult for the Committee as presently constituted to maintain such standards if its business increases sharply. As the University Committee on Tenure is now considering a comprehensive revision of the Regulations concerning Faculty Tenure, the Judicial Committee has submitted to the Tenure Committee a detailed statement of its views on the reorganization of reviewing procedures in general and those of the Judicial Committee in particular. The Chairman of the Committee is sitting with the Committee on Tenure during its discussions.

For the present it is recommended that departments observe carefully the suggestions made by the Vice President (Academic Administration) in his memorandum of January 28, 1971 concerning departmental procedures in consultation and voting upon questions of faculty status. The Chairman of the Judicial Committee assisted in formulating these, and the Committee believes observance of them will assure compliance with standards of due process.

It is important also to bear in mind that recommendations against reappointment must not rest in any significant degree upon grounds which can be impeached as violating constitutional rights of the faculty member, or infringing his academic freedom, or lacking demonstrable factual support. Scrupulous care in departmental procedure may avoid the unpleasant, exhausting, and often divisive experience of a hearing before the Judicial Committee.

Finally, attention is invited to the requirement in Section 9 (revised numbering) of the Regulations concerning Faculty Tenure that the department chairman or other appropriate administrative officer "discuss from time to time with each probationary faculty member in his department the progress and growth the faculty member is making." In several cases probationary members of the faculty have presented considerable evidence that this requirement has not been fully met. Although the Judicial Committee has taken the position that adequate counseling cannot be considered an absolute prerequisite to a decision against reappointment upon grounds which counseling might have removed, yet it is clear that justice to probationary members of the faculty requires that they be advised of their deficiencies and given opportunity to overcome them. Even if non-reappointment were upheld, the Committee might therefore feel compelled, in a case where failure to counsel seemed highly prejudicial, to recommend some redress for the probationer.

CHARLES H. MCLAUGHLIN
Chairman

XXII. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Reported for Information

During the present academic year, the Senate Library Committee has met on a monthly schedule. Among major items of concern for the Committee were the issues connected with the non-appointment of a librarian to the St. Paul Center, the problems of support and management of the departmental and branch libraries, and the difficulties created by faculty patrons who are reluctant to return books to the library. The Committee voted to support the Librarian's policy to restrict access to circulation records. The Committee will also support the library in its endeavor to retrieve volumes from those faculty members who do not heed the Circulation Department's recall notices. The Committee hopes that our faculty colleagues will cooperate with the librarians in this matter and may, at a future date, recommend stricter policies to guard against the abuse of library privileges.

The Library Committee expressed its appreciation to Dr. Edward Stanford upon his retirement from the directorship and pledged its support to Dr. Ralph Hopp, the new Director of the Twin Cities Libraries.

GERHARD H. WEISS
Chairman

XXIII. ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND PUBLICATIONS

Reported for Information

The Committee on Printing & Publications has been engaged in the following activities during the academic 1970-71 year:

1. Acted on requests from various departments for approval to modify style and format of stationery, bulletins and other official printed materials.
2. Continued consultation with Vice President Hale Champion's staff on plans for modifications in printed materials to effect economies and improve the functional characteristics of large-quantity printed supplies.
3. Continued to work toward a new design for the official University stationery and related printing. At this writing; several logotypes have been developed and will be reviewed widely before final selection is made.
4. Developed a plan for a comprehensive study of present University publications which, it is hoped, can lead to the development of guidelines which, in turn, can lead to economies and greater effectiveness in the broad variety of publications now being produced at the University. The study, as now anticipated, will be undertaken in conjunction with the School of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Again, the Committee is grateful to Mr. Lester Metz, Director of Printing and Graphics and to members of his staff (particularly Miss Jean Shearn, Mr. Arthur Holt, Mr. Richard Smith) for their assistance and advice so generously shared with the Committee.

DONALD Z. WOODS
Chairman

XXIV. ANNUAL REPORT SENATE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES AND PLANNING

Reported for Information

The Senate Committee on Resources and Planning met fortnightly during the academic year. The following items offer a summary of the committee's activities.

1. Toward 1985 and Beyond — A Report from the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning
Background and Purpose:

A Task Force of the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning began with the premise that it is essential for the University of Minnesota to develop a long-range plan to guide its decision-making, and to participate in long-range planning on a continuing basis. The lack of a comprehensive long-range plan for the University has created great difficulties concerning such vital current issues as the development of the St. Paul Campus, the possible establishment of a University campus in Rochester and West Bank Campus planning. Inability to assess significant issues such as these against an overall long-range plan for the University greatly weakens the decision-making process.

Since its inception in 1967, the Senate Committee on Resources and Planning has recognized the need for comprehensive long-range planning by the University. In 1968, it developed a plan for conducting a long-range planning effort; however, this effort would have cost approximately \$200,000 and was not implemented because of limited resources.

In 1969-70, the decision was made to proceed with a smaller-scale version of the comprehensive long-range planning effort because of the great need for a planning document against which current decisions could be assessed. A small Task Force was therefore created which did most of its work in Summer 1970 and wrote this report in Fall 1970. The study is limited in scope, the Task Force having had little opportunity to do other than to rely on existing data bases.

The Task Force placed primary emphasis on organizational and related aspects designed to make the University more flexible and adaptive. Less consideration was given to detailed issues concerning the University because of the limited resources available and also because the future, thirty years hence, is so nebulous.

Despite its limitations, there are, in the committee's opinion, merits in the long-range planning guide because 1) the developed long-range plan can serve as a first approximation to a more exhaustive long-range plan, 2) the plan will permit the assessment of current problems against at least a skeletal comprehensive plan, and 3) long-range planning is a process, not a state, and future long-range planning activities can strengthen the initial long-range plan.

The committee therefore presents this long-range plan as a first effort in the development of a comprehensive long-range plan for the University. It is intended to serve as a guide in the handling of important immediate problems. Realizing its limitations, it is hoped that it will also serve as an incentive for full-scale implementation of long-range planning by the University.

Structure:

The report falls into two major parts; Part One (Chapters I, II, and III) presents background materials, while Part Two (Chapters IV and V) contains the main discussion of the University, its mission, and the planning principles developed. There are also two appendices; the first includes detailed data on population in Minnesota and geographic origins of students, the second analyzes the uniqueness of University programs.

Part One begins with a history of higher education in Minnesota, in Chapter I, to permit balanced assessments of the present and the future. Next, Chapter II contains an examination of the future physical and social environment, a consideration of likely trends and an investigation of some implications of these trends for university education. A review of the state aims for higher education in Minnesota in the years ahead, as developed by the Higher Education Coordinating Commission follows in Chapter III as well as projections of student enrollment in post-secondary institutions through the year 2000.

Part Two begins with a mission statement for the University of Minnesota which is designed to define the University's role in the State Higher Education System. Student demand by 1985 for the unique elements of the University are also developed in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains a series of planning principles to serve as guides for the development of the University System in the years ahead as well as a consideration of specific implications of these planning principles for the University and its role in the State Higher Education System.

Discussions of the report with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy are now in progress. It is expected that copies of the report will be available for general distribution early in the summer. Copies may then be obtained from the secretary of the committee, Mrs. Lois Cooper.

2. Legislative Building Request

To understand the policy implications of the University's Legislative Building Request, the committee considered the rationale which undergirds the overall 1971 Request as well as the individual items. New in the 1971 Request was a separate item for general master planning funds. Previously planning funds have been earmarked for particular buildings. The committee supported the request for general master planning funds and moreover, saw the need for funds to support academic planning as well.

On the basis on the review of the 1971 Request, the committee believes that it should be involved in shaping the guidelines that will later be used to establish priorities in future legislative building requests.

3. A Plan for the Development of the Social Sciences and Humanities in St. Paul in the 1970's

Committee members discussed jointly with the Senate Committee on Educational Policy both a progress report and a second draft presented by Mr. Bohrnstedt, chairman of the subcommittee to study the development of the St. Paul Campus in the 1970's.

4. Parking and Related Problems

Committee members from the Twin Cities Campus met early in the fall to consider parking and related problems. In approaching this matter, the committee applied three planning principles which resulted from earlier deliberations: 1) the support of policies to reduce vehicular traffic within the campus and to separate, insofar as possible, vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic, 2) the present Minneapolis Campus boundaries should remain fixed (with two possible exceptions), 3) the University should actively encourage and support the development of an effective metropolitan public transportation system.

In light of these principles, the committee concluded that 1) the size and location of proposed parking facilities are consistent with planning principles, and 2) a substantial increase in the revenues generated by parking is required, both to sustain present operations, and to provide resources for the required construction and maintenance of new facilities.

To resolve the remaining issues, the committee proposed the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Parking, with representation from all affected parties (including representatives from the surrounding community) to work cooperatively with the Central Parking Office. Subsequently the Ad Hoc Parking Advisory Committee was appointed and is in the process of completing its final report.

The chairman expresses his appreciation to members of the committee for their constructive efforts during this academic year. In sharp contrast to the previous year, there was active participation by student members on the Summer Task Force which developed the planning report *Toward 1985 and Beyond* and on the full committee. Special thanks go to members of the Summer Task Force and staff for their work in beginning the long-range planning process for the University.

WARREN E. IBELE
Chairman

XXV. ANNUAL REPORT OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON SUMMER SESSIONS

Reported for Information

The Committee met regularly twice each quarter during the academic year 1970-71. The following topics provided the major basis for discussion—on all of which the Committee has made or will make recommendations.

1. The tuition structure for the 1971 Summer Session.
2. Issues involved in faculty teaching loads and the faculty salary structure given credit module changes. (This will not be a matter for the 1971 Summer Session, but will appear in 1972.)
3. If Legislative monies are appropriated sequentially to fund the Summer Session operation, the priority of uses to which such monies might be applied.
4. The Summer Session in transition: between an appendage to the academic year and a genuine fourth quarter.

Student attendance at Committee meetings was not on a par with 1969-70 (nor was faculty for that matter). But the Chairman would highly commend students Ervin Hegge and Thomas Smith who in their two years of service on the Committee brought not only faithful attendance, but also exhibited a properly cheerful skepticism toward bureaucracy and yet made many constructive proposals. Students are a valuable addition.

A personal comment in conclusion. Committees are a necessary evil. But, after twenty years of sitting on or chairing such bodies, a sabbatical (in this case without pay) will be welcome.

JOHN G. TURNBULL
Retiring Chairman

XXVI. ANNUAL REPORT OF UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON TENURE

Reported for Information

The University Committee on Tenure is engaged in the process of rewriting the Regulations on Tenure. The Senate Judicial Committee, the Senate Faculty Affairs Committee and the Administrative Committee are involved in the drafting process. Hopefully, the proposed revision of the Tenure Regulations will be ready for consideration by the Faculty Senate sometime next Fall.

CARL A. AUERBACH
Chairman

XXVII. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE GOVERNING COUNCIL

Reported for Information

The University College Governing Council met about 30 times between August, 1970 and May 14, 1971. Its mission is to serve as a surrogate faculty for University College. Programs of University College which existed before the Governing Council was created by Senate action last spring were permitted to continue without substantive review. These include the Inter-College Program, which permits students to assemble unique curricula leading to Bachelors' degrees from among courses offered by more than one College; UC-3-075, the up-to-15 credit Independent Study Course; and the Living-Learning Center. Almost the entire attention of the Governing Council during the first 9 months of its existence was devoted to the new Experimental Programs of Collegiate Scope mission. A number of proposals were received and discussed. A planning-pilot year for an experimental college was approved in time for it to become active during fall quarter. During spring quarter, 1971, this group's new proposal, which includes criteria for earning a baccalaureate degree, was approved. A planning-pilot program for a Student Tutorial College on the Duluth Campus was approved early in winter quarter. A proposal for continuation and expansion of this program is currently under consideration. The University College Governing Council was given the responsibility for determining University of Minnesota participation in the University Without Walls program. It recently approved a year-long pilot University Without Walls program. Copies of approved programs have been filed with the Clerk of the Senate.

NORMAN KEER
Chairman

XXVIII. OLD BUSINESS

XXIX. NEW BUSINESS

XXX. NECROLOGY

R. STUART HOYT
1918-1971

G. HARRY LINDAHL
1930-1971

ARTHUR JOHN MADDEN
1919-1970

JOHN R. NEETZEL
1906-1971

W. E. PETERSON
1892-1971

BURTON J. ROBERTSON
1882-1971

THORVALD SCHANTZ - HANSEN
1891-1971

THEODORE S. WEIR
1898-1971

BETTE YOUNG
1943-1971